A VINDICATION, OF THE REFORMED RELIGION,

From the Reflections of a

ROMANIST:

Written for Information of all, who will receive the Truth in Love.

By WILLIAM RAIT Minister of the Gospel at DUNDIE.

2 Cor. 13. 8. *We can do nothing against the Truth, but for the Truth.*

Cyprianus ad Pompeium epist. 74. *Quæ ista obstinatio est, quæve præsumptio, humanam traditionem divinæ dispositioni anteponere, nec animadvertere, indignari & irasci Deum, quod ejus divina præcepta solvit & præterit humana traditio? Sine causa colunt me, mandata & doctrinas hominum docentes.*

ABERDENE, Printed by JOHN FORBES *Younger*, Printer to the Town and University, dwelling on the Mercat-place, 1671.

130. g. 4.

BIBLIOTHECA

To the truly Honorable, and really Religious,

The Laird of HALGREEN Elder,

Grace and Peace be multiplied,

SIR,

The great work of a Christian in the world, is to prefer Heaven to Earth, the law of the Lord to the law of sin, Gospell concernments to all earthly interests, when the one cometh in competition with or opposition to the other. The first fall of man, as the schoolmen termeth it, was *Aversio a Deo*, and *conversio ad creaturam*. A turning from God to the creature. Then sin obtained precedencie to Grace, folly to Wisdom, lust to the law of God. Our health and safety cometh in, by recoverie and cure, our victorie by a reserve: therefore God sent his Son into the world, with the Gospel remedy, to turn us from ungodliness, and worldly lusts, *Titus* 2. 12. to wean us from the inordinate love of the substance, and shaddowes of the world. 1. *John* 2. 15. to espouse our love to himself, that we may be presented as a chaste

chaste Virgin to Christ, 2 Cor 11. 2. For this we pray, we preach, we labour, we make use of Ordinances, and goe about every duty. This is the scope and course of a Christian, and whatever hindreth this design is not to be approved by him. Wood, hay, stuble, is not a Gospel cure. Pure Religion and undefiled, can only better the heart, mortifie corruption, subdue the body of death, subject the whole man to the soveraignety of Jesus Christ, mend the world, and make men live holily, righteously and soberly. When this salve was rightly applyed in the primitive Church. O how wonderfully did the Lord bless the cure, and proved the medicine to be good by great successe. How were men bound to their duty, by the awe and love of GOD on their hearts: that the very *Heathens* and *Tenters* were amused and forced to give testimony to the doctrine, that it was of GOD. But when men afterwards did beginne to mixe the wine with water, and handle the word of GOD deceitfully: They then became lovers of pleasure more then lovers of GOD, then fell they in dotage with the pompe and pride of the world. Which disease did break forth notoriously first at *Rome*, thence it spread and infected many Churches (*Urbs rea flagitii et, urbs lethi causa putanda es. Urbs fera, Tibrinæ cui famulantur aquæ.*) As heathen *Rome* usurped dominion, so *Rome* now being animated by the *Pope*, and his Coreplices taking advantage by the division of Princes, and encreasing her wealth by their wrack, like some who live near the Sea, as if there had been no law of Christ, *to deny our selves take up our cross and follow him*, turned the Gospel-simplicitie into state-policy, and the Ppoe degenerating from the Christian carriage of primitive fathers, sought secular greatness chiefly, put on a triple Crown, followed the pompe of the world. And all this is done under the name of Christ, pretence of Religion, and *in ordine ad spiritualia*, which maketh the sin more sinful, and their way irreconcilable with the dogmatick faith of a Christian who believeth the Scripture. The Church of Rome was once famous for Gospel profession. Her faith was spoken of through all the world in *Tertullians* time who lived in the second centurie, Rome hath this character from him, *lib de præscript. adversus Hæreticos*,

Felix

Felix Roma, cui totam doctrinam, Apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt, legem & Prophetas cum Evangelicis & Apostolicis literis misces, & inde potat fidem eam, aqua signat, Spiritu Sancto vestit, Eucharistia pascit, martyrio exhortatur, & adversus hanc institutionem nominem recipit. Happie Rome to whom the Apostles poured forth their doctrine with their blood, who mixeth Law and Gospel together, and drinketh in faith that way, taketh on the Baptismal seal thus, cloatheth her self with the graces of the Holy Ghost, feedeth by the Sacrament of the Supper, confirmeth the doctrine by martyrdome, and receiveth none but on these termes. *Quantum mutatur!* O how great an alteration is there? Rome is not like that which is was once. For then they were made martyrs for the faith, now they make martyrs for the same faith, then they had pure ordinances, now they pollute them all with superstition and humane inventions. *Bernard lib. 4. de consid. ad Eugen. Invisi Terra & Cœlo impii in Deum, temerarii in sancta, seditiosi ad seinvicem, simplicissimi dissimulatores, malignissimi proditores quos nominem amantes nemo amat. &c.* The primitive Fathers studied modesty, humility, and Gospel carriage. *Cornelius* to *Cyprian* in his Epistles, breatheth forth much self-denyal. *Cyprian* that holy Martyr at the Council of *Carthage*, saith, *neque enim quisquam nostrum, se Episcopum Episcoporum constituit.* i. e. None of us maketh himself an universal Bishop. And divine *Augustin* writing to *Hierom epist.* 97. uttereth, himself thus, *in multis rebus Augustinus Hieronymo minor est*, this was Gospel like. But now the Pope is the Prince of pride, naming himself infallible, consequently incorrigible, & by the same reason impeccable, *nam omnis peccans in eo quod peccat errat.* Every man erreth in as much as he sinneth, saith the school. If our hope were in this life only, and no retribution hereafter; or if the Alcoran were our rule, this deportment being full of carnal wisdom, proclaimeth them witty politicianes. But seeing the contrary is sure by the undoubted word of GOD, this their way is [illegible]ly, and it is admirable how understanding men approve their sayings. This their way hath wronged Christianity highly, and many sad effects have followed upon this pompous alteration of the Primitive frame. *First*, It hath turned many I-

tallans

Italians who live near the Court of Rome, voide of all true Religion, and dyed them with Atheisme. So that as it is reported of them in *Print*, they will call proverbially their Idiots Christians, and when they would name a fool, they say he is a Christian, as if Christianitie were a fable, and high follie. A discerning person who travelled through *Italie* many years ago, told me, that he heard some of them publicklie blaspheme *Jesus Christ*, by words which should not be repeated, and yet go unpunished. This is the fruit of their state way. For now it is far more like to the state of Rome, nor the old *Church* of Rome. *Secondly*, It exposeth Christian Religion to reproach, and stumbleth many. The *Iews* are hindred to come in by their superstitious worship. The *Eastern Church* which is the most ancient, agreeing almost with us in all doctrinals, (as their *Confession of Faith* emitted by *Cyrill the Patriarch of Constantinople* testifieth,) is much offended at their Church dividing way. We are vexed with their plots, blots, underminding courses. They sowe cockle amongst our wheat, and tares in our field, while men sleepe. Of all men on Earth in any visible incorporation pretending to *Christianity*, they have made the greatest breach in the *Catholick church*, and taken the tittle to themselves contrar to all reason. The Paganes perceiving our breaches are hardened in their blind way When their were not so great breaches in the *Christian Church*, *Chrysostom on the Galatians*, bringeth in the Gentile speaking thus, *Vellem fieri Christianus, sed nescio cui adhæream, multæ sunt inter vos pugnæ, seditiones, & tumultus; nescio quod dogma eligam, quod præferam, singuli enim dicunt, ego verum dico i. e. I would be a Christian but know not to whom I shal adhere, there be such differences amongst you, I know not what to choose, what to preferre, every one saith he hath the truth on his side.* For this we are derided by *Iews* and *Gentiles*, and the *Church of Christ* is divided. This objection may be soon solved, by these who adhere to the Scripture, sensed by sound antiquitie: But to them who are without, it maketh a great muster, and is a mountaine in the way, which none have towred up more then the *Romanists*, by craft and might they have stated a faction, and fixed a Schism in the universal church. Is it not high arrogance, that a town in *Italy*,

and

and a pettie Prince there should make a monopolie, and obtrude their ware, *pro arbitratu & imperio sub pœna anathematis*, upon all the *Christians* in the world, what have we to do with an *Italian Prince*, and who gave him right over us? Albeit these rents made in the church by secular interests, be matter of mourning, yet there be a providence in it, and this is permitted by the wisdom of GOD, that these who are approven may be made manifest. 1. *Cor.* 11. 19. *Vt fides habendo tentationem, habeat probationem*, as saith *Tertull. contra Hæres. cap.* 1. *Divina veritas calida oppositione agitatur, ut adversus illius adversarios defendi possit, considerari diligentius, intelligi clarius, prædicari constantius, & ab adversariorum motis quæstionibus discendi existat occasio.* Divine truth is cunningly opposed, that it may be defended more vigorously, considered more attentively, understood more clearly, preached more instantly, and that from the questions of adversaries, we may have the more occasion of learning truth. Saith *Aug. de civit. Dei. lib.* 16. *cap.* 2. It is noted by Historians, that in the *tenth Centurie*, called the unhappie Age, there were no Heresies started nor opposed, they were then asleep, and cared neither for truth nor errour. Seriousnes about these matters was at that time suspended. Yet it was *infelix seculum*, & it had been better for some that the tares had appeared, and then trysted with speedie opposition. Albeit evil be not good, yet sometimes, *bonum est malum esse*, as *Aug.* telleth us in *his Enchiridion*, it is good that evil be, *qui bonus est non sineret malè esse, nisi omnipotens etiam de malo faceret bene.* He would not suffer evil to be, if he being Omnipotent, could not bring good out of it. We are not therefore to cast away our confidence, nor become despondent, albeit Poperie encreaseth, & Papists way bold. The only wise Lord knoweth why it is so, & how to order this broken condition for good. When they like the old Pagans at Rome [who fathered *Portenta Gnosticorum & aliorum Hæreticorum*, the absurdities of *Gnostickes*, and other Hereticks upon the orthodoxe *Christians*, as Church Historie telleth us,] blot our doctrine & worship with all the reproaches which malice can devise: who can tel but the holie providence of GOD may bring us out amongst the pots, with our feathers like yellow gold. And he who worketh manie of his workes by

men.

mean instruments, may put such to it, that his strength may be perfected in weakness. I have contrat to my designe, engaged into this debate, and do acknowledge that I am a weak sinful man, my inclination is averse from janglings, and I have had more satisfaction in going about the work of my *Calling*, in practicals of Religion, nor ever I had in penning or publishing this debate. But what could I do? Adversaries invaded the flock, pursued me within the ports, when my back was at the wall, and I had no purpose for warre, stealed the sheep out of my bosome, and averred confidentlie that they were fed with rot-grasse in stead of wholsome food. Should I not in this exigence defend with such weapons as the Lord would afford? It may be said that the adversarie is stronge at home and abroad, but the Lord on high is more mighty than the noise of many waters. So farre as I am concerned, I rather would choose to fall in the field, nor turne my back, or by finsel silence suffer the truth to be over-laid and stifled. To some this may seem a light matter, and needless worke, yet if all be well understood it will not be found such. The sound of a testimonie for the truth in the ease of subversion, is an eminent durie, if it were for no other end but this, to leave a vvitness, & not to be involved in the shout. Everie *Minister* of the Gospel is bound within his station, to promove Gospel interests, to which Popery is highlie prejudicial: to convince, convert, confute gain-sayers, to confirme the weak, and undeceive the simple. I am much mistaken if this be superfluous worke, seeing it is one of the ends of our Calling. It is to be regrafted indeed, that by debates for our just possession, past prescription, we should be diverted from more comfortable and edifying worke: seeing ordinarlie this way is so unsuccessful that few adversaries once engageing use to yeeld, and will rather act their parties to defend one errour with another, *ne videantur errasse*, nor with divine *Aug.* make a retractation. VVlnich evidenceth much pride, and unmortified self-love, but very small respect to the Gospel. *Vectura officii* is ours, and *cura eventus* belongeth to the Lord, who will make a good accourie of all his affaires, & cause the face of adversaries slide in due time. Now Sir, seeing I resolved upon these considerations

to

to publiſh this Vindication, following the cuſtō, I have ſhelte-red it under the Patrociny of your Name, ſo much valued for Religiō & Vertue. When *Hiterō* writeth to *Dardanus* he calleth him *Chriſtianorum nobiliſſime, nobilium Chriſtianiſſime.* I will not make uſe of that compellation to you, I know ye love not ſo well words to proclaim you good, as thoſe which may make you better. It may be ſaid without any aſſentation, that ye are a ſerious lover, and diligent practiſer of thoſe Goſpel verities which have been from the beginning. And it will appear by proof, as *Tertullian* ſpeaketh, *antiquum nihil aliter fuit quam ſumus.* This maketh me confident, that ye will entertain this Tractat for the truth. To ſpeak of your deſcent and ancient extract, it belongeth to Hiſtorians and Heraulds, not to me. Yet if any doubt of that, let them read *Hector Boetius* hiſtorie concerning the reign of *Alexander the third, anno. Chr.* 1208. *fol.* 300. And again about the reign of *King Robert Bruce, anno Chri.* 1320. *fol* 317. in both which, famous mention is made of your Relatives; Beſide the *Rudera* of that old Caſtle in *Murray* called yet by your Name, proclaimeth this much, *ſuimet Troes.* Neither ſhall I inſiſt upon the conſtancie and frequencie of your fervent devotion theſe ſeventie years and upwards. And how ye preveen the morning watches in the coldeſt ſeaſon, this commendeth the grace of GOD in you. Your *Antelucana* is ſuch, well backed with the practiſe of righteouſneſs, holineſs, peaceableneſs, meeknes, temperance, patience, zeal, and aboundance of ſpiritual fortitude, if any will deny this, they either know you not, or love you not. I intend not by this to ſtir your corruption, that were not friendly breath, but to further your faith, and that others may learn of you to be religious indeed. Go on worthie *Sir*, in your Chriſtian exerciſe, well may ye flouriſh in old age, well may ye finiſh your courſe with joy, O that all deſcended of you, may learn to follow your ſteps, in holineſs, and righteouſneſs, this will be the mercy of your familie, which is daily deſired by

Your well Wiſher and
Servant in the Goſpel,
W. R.

A Preface to the Reader.

THE Congregation of Dvndee, Christian Reader, was by the good hand of GOD, for the space almost of an hundred yeares by-gone, preserved from the infection of Poperie; but of late some have been perverted by seducers, to the prejudice of the Gospel, and great scandal of the incorporation: amongst whom, one young woman descended of Religious and Honest Parents, being led away with the errour occasioned this debate. For after conference she seemed to be much affected, and least that which then appeared to take impression on her minde, should slippe out of her memory, some grounds by way of a Dialogue were shortly written down, with several wholsome Christian admonitions; this short dialogue was by her put into the hands of a trafficquing Romanist, and in stead of her Conversion so much desired, eight sheets of paper are stuffed with reflections, not only on it, but on the Gospel-doctrine, which is according to Godlinesse, and all the professours thereof. Ere I heard any such thing, this pamphlet was spread with artificial insinuations, and quickly convoyed from hand to hand for a time, at last a well wisher to the truth sent a copie to me, with this desire that I would revive and refute it. At first I enclined to passe it

with

with silence, because I thought discerning men would easily espy its weakness. Thereafter hearing that some Popishly enclined did magnifie it, least the reformed Doctrine should suffer prejudice, I was advysed to pen a Reply with this resolution, that except some new arguments be brought forth, which are not answered by reformed Divines, or here by me, I will not trifle my time so much allotted for better work, as to debate more on the subject here contained. What is said, may (to my uptaking) satisfie such as love the truths of the Gospel, and in reason convince gain-sayers. But if men will undervalue the word of GOD, right reason, and shutting their eyes, declare themselves unsatisfiable, an evil humour hath caused them to erre. And I have other imployment, nor to wrestle with such. Wisdom will be justified of her own children. And in this time when prophanness and Popery walk on every side, blessed is he who keepeth his garments clean, and doth nothing against the truth, but for it. Seminary Priests are very diligent, sowing their cockle amongst us in this land, they have their own abettors, proxies, and procutors. Is it not then the duties of good Christians, to arme themselves with the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of GOD, and keep their ground against adversaries? The face of truth is beautiful, and the salvation of souls precious. This short Tractat is chiefly calculated for the Meridian of *Dundee*;

and for any single sincere Christian, who seriously labour for Gospel truths, and to worke out their own Salvation. All such cannot have leasure to read voluminous books, written by more able pens; nor will they be at the expences to buy them; and it may be also that some would not comprehend or relish them, *mediocriter docta, mediocriter doctis placent*, saith the writter of the life of *Pelicanus*. Books are like meats, and somewhat of suitable sympathie, contributeth to make them edifying; if this convince, convert, or establish men in the truth, it is the blessing of the GOD of truth, for which I shal' bless his Name. If not, it is my testimony to that truth wherein I have lived, and hope in the strength of Iesus Christ to die. So fare I'le endeavoure to serve my generation, this will be my peace whatever the event be; and my conscience is witness that I hazard to publish this debate for no selfish end, or any other respect whatever.

The Romanists for upholding their faulty fabrick, have forged many unwarrantable devices, some of which I shal briefly touch here, that by these as a teste, ye may discern how they build with wood, hay, stuble, and daub the work all along with untempered morter.

Their first engyne is *Matchiavelian*, *calumniare audatter*. If any man appear for truth in the gate, they bend their tongues and pens as bowes with reproaches against such: like that persecuting

perſecuting Roman, who would firſt have the Virgins whom he minded to condemn, deflowred by the hang-man, that they might not be heard, but die without regrate. And as the primitive Chriſtians were ſome-times put into beaſts skins by their perſecutours, to the end that dogs might devoure them greedily: So deal they with reformed Writters, that truth be not heard from them. How ſinful is this way contrar to that Scripture, *Titus* 3. 2. *ſpeak evil of no man?* This is moſt like to the courſe which the adverſaries of truth have ſtill keeped; So did they of old with the Prophets, *Pſalm.* 69. v. 10. 11. Yea with Ieſus Chriſt himſelf, *Matth.* 11. 19. *Matth.* 12. 24, and all his Apoſtles, 1. *Cor.* 4. 13. that they might overlay the truth, and make them the more eaſie prey to the teeth of obloquie and prejudice. What is this bauling to the cauſe before any diſcerning perſon? *Quid ad rhombum?* *Michael* the Arch-Angel diſputing with the Devil, durſt not bring againſt him a railing accuſation, *Ind.* v. 9. Let not this hinder men from hearing truth, nor terrifie any from giving teſtimonie to it. We are bound as Chriſtians not only to bear the ſcourge of tongues, but more alſo for the Goſpels ſake when called to it. *Auguſtin* ſaid to *Petilian*, *his tongue was not the fan. I am a man in the floore of Chriſt, and if good grain will be laid up in the Garner, blow the wind as it will.* So we may ſay to ſuch railers, yea, if the adverſarie would write not only

paſquils

pasquils, but a book of this kind, we may bind it to our shoulders, and wear it as our crown; For the Lord will in due time, *wipe of the rebuke of his people*, (*Is.* 25. 8.) *which they bear for his Name.* That saying of *Bernard* is sweet, *Cimba me comitte, in tanto discrimine confidens in Domino, qui pro illo recte loquentibus, pro illo laborantibus dicit, Adsum.* He run the risk trusting in the Lord, who hath promised presence to all, who speak and act rightlie for him. And heroickly *Luther* to the same purpose, if truth be on my side, *quidni pro viribus agam*, why should I not do my uttermost, *sim homicida, sim adulter, modo silentii non arguar, dum Christus patitur.* Let them call me what they will, if I be not guilty of sinful silence, when Christ suffereth in his truth. It is a very smal matter, upon this account to be judged of men, 1. *Cor.* 4. 3. these things are light and heavy as we ordinarily take them. If this strain of reproaching did siste at us it were not so much, but they reproach the written word of GOD, and sentence it boldly of *imperfection*, contrar to *Psalm.* 19. 7. 2. *Tim.* 3. 15. 17. and of *obscuritie*, as if it were not a *light and lantherne to our paths*, *Psalm.* 119. 105. Yea, they shamelesly averre, that the authority of the Church, and Pope of Rome, is greater to us nor Scripture. Is it not lamentable, that men called Christians, for pompous selfish interests, should laboriously studie to cast aspersions upon the unspotted word of GOD, and depretiate it so in the world!

world! May not this render Popery suspicious to any knowing man, that the abettors thereof decline the written word of GOD, to be the sole umpire of faith and manners, and endeavour to discredit it before the Nations; which is the touch-stone of truth, and best fence we have against Satan and all his complices; such *non sunt audiendi*, saith holy *Aug. Confes. lib. 6. cap. 5.* they should not in this be heard far less obeyed.

Their second device, when they are pressed with the truth, is to coin evil grounded distinctions, and with this ley money to make merchandise of poor simple souls. Needle-headed men have strangely acted their inventions herein, and crübled Gospel truths thus, that he is now thought the best and most learned Papist, who can find out subtile subterfugies, and receptacles against plain Scripture verities. So that the Romanists are the great foxes which eat up the tender vines. Other Sectaries who separat themselves from the Church builded on the foundation, *Eph.* 2. 20. and deface the doctrine which is according to Godliness, are of lesser magnitude. That ye may know what sort of proppes uphold their rotten building, take these five instances. *First*, When we prove *that the Scripture is the rule of faith*, this they grant in part, but say they it is a partial, not the total rule; they must sowder somewhat of their own tradition to it, erre they acknowledge it for a rule. This is a reasonless shift. If

the

the rule be not total and perfect in its own kinde, for its own ends, it is no rule at all, but a semi-rule, *regula nec appositionem nec ablationem admittit, saith Theophilact, on the 3. chap. to the Philip.* Nothing can be added to, or taken from a rule; the law of nature, the law of reason, are sufficient for their own ends; so is the written word of GOD for salvation. When we say, *Secondly, that the word of GOD cannot have authority from men, therefore the Scripture is judge of the Church, and not the Church of the Scripture.* They answer by a leaden distinction, that it hath authority from the Church in respect of us, but not in respect of it self. This is a reasonless evasion, for all authority is an act, *quoad extra*, and relative to us. The Scriptures have excellency and dignity internal, but all its authority is external and relative to men. So that distinction is null. If the Scripture hath its authority from the testimony of their Church, then their faith must be ultimatly resolved into their Church testimony, as more authoritative nor the word of GOD. *Propter quod unumquodque est tale, illud ipsum est magis tale.* Therefore Popish faith by this maxime is not divine, but ecclesiastick and humane: Now the Church and faith of Believers should be builded immediatly upon the doctrine of the Prophets and Apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, *Eph.* 2. 20. Therefore the Pope with his traditions cannot found the Church, not

the

the faith of Christians; other foundation can no man lay, then that which is laid. 1. *Cor.* 3. 11. To this they returne a distinction, that Iesus Christ is the principal, and the Pope the secondary foundation; seeing it was said to *Peter, upon this rock I will build my Church.* This subterfuge is like the rest; if this was said to *Peter* personally, as *Tertul. de præscrip.* thinketh, then not to his successours, suppose the Pope were the man; a personal individual prerogative is incommunicable. If it was not personal, but to him and his successours, then if the Apostle *Paul* were living, the Pope behoved to be above him in dignity and Church prerogative, by reason *Peter* was above him, and he succeedeth to his superioritie. This to any discerner may appear absurd. Beside the Church is builded on the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, *Eph.* 2. 20. then not upon one Apostle, take the words as ye will. The true meaning of these words, *upon this rock I will build my Church* is this, the confession of *Peter* concerning Iesus Church, the Son of the living GOD, was a rock on which the Church was builded. This interpretation is authorized by *Augustin.* who interpreteth the words thus, *Tract. ult. in Iohan. & serm.* 13. *de verbis Apost.* he giveth also strong reason for it, *lib.* 1. *retract cap.* 21. *non enim dictum est Petro, tu es petra, sed tu es Petrus.* which reason *Valentia* challengeth in vain, *disp.* 1. *to* 3. *quæst.* 1. *punct.* 7. Further, there cannot be two foun-

dations, if we speak properly. If no man can lay another as the Scripture speaketh, why should it be asserted? Christ Iesus alone set forth in the doctrine of Prophets and Apostles, is that solid foundation on which we build all our salvation; he is that sure foundation laid in *Zion*, and no wayes can this without blasphemie be applyed to the Pope, seeing the Apostle *Peter* maketh application of it to Christ only, 1. *Peter* 2. 6.

Thirdly, When we assert with the Scripture, *that Marriage is honourable amongst all*, therefore they should not forbid it. Their answer is, that *all* should not be taken here absolutely, for then a brother might marry his sister, but only of persons not prohibited, and their votaries are such. Is not this a fig-leaf covering? Incest is forbidden by the law of GOD. But where are Church men forbidden by GOD to marry, it is honourable among them saith the written word; who can bind men to the contrar of that which the Lord hath permitted and commanded? The evasion about the Sacrament of the Supper is of the same kind; when it is objected that Christ said expresly of the Cup, *drink ye all of it*. By *all* say they, is meaned all Priests, but not all Christians. Is this to be endured with patience, to see men tear so the sense of Scripture with sophisms. If (*all*) relate to them as Ministers of the Gospel, then they should have the bread only, and all privat Christians should be barred: for he who said

drink

drink ye all of it, ſaid likewiſe to the ſame (*all*) *take eat.*

Fourthly, When they are challenged of Superſtition and Idolatrie, by breach of the ſecond Command, here there is a diſtinction not lacking betwixt the worſhip called λατρεια reſerved for GOD; and δυλεια which they avowedly ſay, ſhould be given to images, Saints, &c. And this they father on *Auguſtin*. But theſe two words are promiſcuouſly taken in Scripture, and both of them given to GOD, as ſhal be proved in its proper place. Papiſts give λατρεια to *Images*, Reliques, and Croſs of *Chriſt*; Thus they confound themſelves. When *Iohn the divine* would have worſhipped the Angel, doth he not forbid him, *Rev:* 22. 9. and ſay *worſhip GOD?* Belike he knew not this diſtinction. *Is it not called will worſhip*, *Col* 2. 23. Then it is not δυλεια but ἐθελοθρησκεια. Neither doth *Auguſtin* make uſe of that diſtinction in the Popiſh ſenſe, he was farre from thinking that Religious worſhip ſhould be tendered to Saint or Angel, for he ſaith, *lib. de vera Relig. cap. vlt. Honorandi ſunt propter imitationem, non adorandi propter Religionem. And epiſt*, 44. *ſcias inquit a Chriſtianis nullum coli mortuorum.* He biddeth us praiſe the Martyres, honour their memories, follow their foot-ſteps, *ſed DEVM Martyrum colite*, worſhip the GOD of Martyrs onlie. This diſtinction then is groundleſs. *Is* it not lamentable that men profeſſing

fessing Christianitie, should so hazard upon Idolatrie, Superstition and will worship, with a deceitful distinction, which can neither satisfie reason nor conscience? And dare any tender Christian think that such jugling work will be his peace in the day of distress and death? What is this but a lie in the right hand? Therefore let all who love and fear the Lord bewarre of that worship, which standeth on such cogling distinctions.

Fifthly, Their great refuge when they cannot maintain these absurdities, is, that we calumniat them, & mistate questions. And if neither of these can serve, then they alleadge, that these are the opinions of some privat Doctors, and not the judgement of their Church. But in this vindication, let all be assured, that to my best uptaking, nothing is fathered on this Adversary but what he saith directly, or cõsequentially, nothing brought against him but that which is either literally, or interpretatively in the written word of GOD, or human Authours. Albeit it be notoriously known that Papists uphold their tottering *Babel* by lies, murthers, treasons, deluding wonders, by corrupting, mutilating, foisting, embezeling diverse testimonies divine and humane, as shal be made out hereafter, yet we have not so learned Christ. The truths of Christs Gospel need not such proppes, and we are not allowed to lie for GOD. It is a meer evasion to cast over what they cannot make good on their privat Doctours. For the decrees

decrees of the council of *Trent* to which now they profess adherence, are purposly contrived in many particulars, like the *Delphian oracles*, and when they lurke under ambiguities, what way shall they be found out but by their Doctours, who are the expositors of their tenets: Beside there be few or none of them cited, whose books are not approven, by Censurers appointed for that effect, the tenour of whose testimonie is, that such books contain nothing contrar to the Catholick faith of the Church of Rome. Is not this equivalent to a Council statute? Do they not impugne our Doctours, *Calvine*, *Luther*, &c, notwithstanding of our famous Confessions of faith, whereof they cannot be ignorant. They deal not only so with their own writters, but also with the Fathers, as some hard Masters use their servants, if they please their humours they will keep them, if not, they will dismisse them, it may be with a stain betwixt termes. Yea they deal worse with such testimonies as relliſh not their taste, for they dispatch and gelde them also. Their Monastries have not occasioned the murther of more infants, nor their Gelders by the *index expurgatorius* have the death of true testimonies, which now being overlaid cannot see the light. Shal not the GOD of truth make inquisition for these crimes in due time? *Surely he will arise and have mercy on Zion*, for some are yet living, *who take pleasure in her stones and favour the dust thereof*.

Thirdly, The third Engyne, which those Engyneers use, is, *the colour of antiquitie, and pretence to closs walking and austeritie*. The Church of Rome to which the Apostle *Paul* did write is indeed ancient, whose faith was spoken of through all the world. But Poperie as it is now dogmatised, is a late invention, plastered with antiquitie, like the *Gibeonites* bread. And so far from rendring men closs walkers, that it is highlie prejudicial to Gospel interests. For *ex natura operis*, it turneth men loose and unfaithful to souls, yea its pompous secular way is verie unsuitable to the simplicitie, and self-denyal required in the Gospel, this is soon proved. The great pillar of the Romish Religion, is the Popes pompous supremacie and infallibilitie: In this saith *Bell. prefat. de Pontifice*, the summe of their Religion consisteth. Consider Reader, which

of

of the Apostles did so empyre it. Not *Peter*, that he forbiddeth and calleth himself a *fellow Elder*, 1. *Peter* 5. 1. Not any Church man for manie Centuries thereafter. For *Gregory* who was Bishop of Rome *anno* 600. curseth the name of *universal Bishop*, which *John Bishop of Constantinople* usurped and saith, *epist. lib.* 4. *Rex superbiæ prope est*, he meaneth Anti-Christ, *Et sacerdotum ei præparatur exercitus*, in this he prophecied truelie. *Estius in lib.* 4. *sent. dist.* 47. being puzled with this testimonie, saith, that by (*universal Bishop*) *Gregory* meaned onlie (*sole Bishop*) who excluded others. This is a meer forgerie, for there were manie Bishops at that time, in the *Greek Church* beside *John of Constantinople*, so he was not *solus Episcopus*. But giving, not granting this to be the sense of the prophecie, it will make against the *Pope of Rome*, who giveth himself out for *sole Bishop*, and all under him his Vicars onlie. This is clear from the historie of the *Trent* Conc. *lib.* 7. *pag.* 599. Father *Simon the Florentine*, there speaketh after the same tenour. *When it is demanded whither any Bishop be Jure Divino, One must answer affirmativelie, One onlie, the Successour of Peter. And thus the famous saying of Cyprian must be expounded, there is but one Bishoprick, and every Bishop holdeth a part thereof, in solidum; otherwise it cannot be defended that the government of the Church is the most perfect of all, that is Monarchical, but must necessarlie fall into an Oligarchie*: All the Popes Prelats did speak then the same language, will not this make him *solus Episcopus*, so that in *Estius* sense, he must be concluded to be *Rex superbiæ*, because he is *sole universal Bishop*. The primitive Fathers studied modestie, charitie, humilitie. But *Head of the whole Church, Prince of Priests, infallible, universal Monarch*, were names unknown to them. Yet this is the Popes motto, *summa rei*, the great foundation, *sine qua corruit Ecclesia*, saith, *Bellarmin in the forecited place*. Further *worship in an unknown tongue*, was not heard in the Church, till it was commanded by *Witalianus*, in the 7. *Cent.* saith *Platina*, and *Aquinas* on the 1. *Cor.* 14. telleth that the worship in the primitive Church, was performed in the vulgar language. *The mutilation of the Sacrament of the Supper by withholding the cup fō the people*, was unknown

to

to antiquitie. For *Valentia de legitimo vſu Euchariſtiæ, cap. 16.* ſaith that the receiving of the Sacrament under one kind came into the Church by no decree, but by the cuſtom of the people, not long before the *Council of Conſtance*, at which time the cuſtom was made a law. *The with-holding Scripture from people* was detected in the primitive Church. Was it not decreed in *the Council of Nice*, ſaith *Agrippa*, that no Chriſtian ſhould be without a Bible, eſpcially if he could read; in *Auguſtin, Cheyſoſtom*, and *Hieroms* dayes, the people are required to ſearch the Scriptures according to the rule, *John 5. 39. Tutius ambulatur per Scripturas*, ſaith *Aug. lib. 3. de doct. Chri. cap. 28.* not by humane traditions or gloſſes. Some names of things occurring in antiquitie, are preſerved in the Roman Church; but it will be found that the Fathers underſtood them not in that ſenſe, nor made uſe of them as they do. The nature of things now in Poperie is unanſwerable to the old names, as ſhal afterward appear. By this we may perceive, that Popery was not from the beginning. The myſterie of iniquitie encreaſing, vain men ſet their poſts beſide the Lords poſts, their threſholds beſide his, *Ezek. 43. 8.* And making up a bodie of ſuperſtitious inventions, have placed Religion in theſe, which they hold forth to the world as eldeſt, and have ſo falne out with Scripture truths, that they are not aſhamed to accuſe them, and their profeſſours of noveltie, hereſie, &c. But be it known to all, that we wil *have* no Religion to be called ours, younger nor *the* Apoſtles and primitive *Chriſtians*; It ſhal either be ſixteen *hundred* years old, it ſhal be founded on the Scripture, ſenſed by pure antiquitie, or elſe not ours.

Beſide *this their* foiſtery, *that which* is foiſted poyſoneth ſouls, and filleth *them* with *the* Eaſt-wind. For by their merits and mediatours, *they* derogat from *the* honour of *Chriſt*, and from *the* faith of *Chriſtians*; ſeeing *he* is is ſo precious to *them who* believe. *1. Pet. 2. 7.* Is it not ſtrange, that contrar to Scripture *they* will deny *the imputation of the righteouſneſs of Chriſt Jeſus to the bleſſed Elect*, and *that imputed righteouſneſs of Saints* is affirmed by them to proſit others, and relieve them from temporal puniſhment. As if *the* death and merits of the Mediatour, were not of ſufficient value, to ſave us from all evil.

They

They say that no man can have certaintie of Salvatiõ by faith, and yet without any revelation, they will canonize others as Saints. Can any be more certain of the salvation of another, nor his own. Their doctrine concerning the Priests intention, taketh away all certaintie of faith: if the Priest do not seriously intend what he professeth to do, there is no Sacrament, no consecration, no ordination. And who but the Lord searcheth the heart, and knoweth human intentions? By *making the Body of Christ now in Heaven, to be corporally present in the Sacrament of the Supper, when it is administred*, they deny many articles of the Christian Creed, they strengthen the heresie of the *Valentinians*, who said that his Bodie was phantastical, not real, they contradict the Scripture which calleth it *the fruit of the vine* after consecration, *Luke* 22. 18. And *Aug. tract. 5. in Iohn*, who saith, *that the bread remaineth bread after the consecration, and the Body of Christ a real Body after the Resurrection.* By their doctrine of Free-will, they make free Grace to stand at the beck of the wil, whither it shal be operative or not. Yea, they make providence in its acting dependent on the will: For this is their tenet. GOD worketh because the will consenteth, not *e contra*, see *Bellar. de gratia & libero arbitrio, lib. 4. cap.* 15. Will it not follow then, that we should thank our will for our Conversion, and intreat it to make grace efficacious, and providence effectual? Seeing it hath a negative voice in all these matters. And what is more prejudicial to the providence, and worship of GOD, or to the efficacie of grace, nor this tenet which *Aug.* refuteth well in his *Enchrid. cap* 32. By *invocation of Saints, the worship of Reliques, and the whole house of their imagerie*, they give the glory of the Lord to another, and are reproved, *Isa* 42. 8. Yea there be many whom they invocat, of whom they are not certain if either they were Saints, or lived in the world. *Cassander* who lived in communion with *Rome*, acknowledgeth, that much superstition is fostered by this way, *consult.* 21. Is it not then soul-damning? By their distinction of *mortal and venial sins*, by *Purgatory*, by *prayer for the dead*, by *their absolution under so bare a degree of contrition*, they make people sin securely for under the name of *venial sins*, they comprehend grievous crimes, as *swearing*

by the wounds of Christ, *Per Membra Christi est venialis irreverentia, & si reverenter juretur nullum videtur esse peccatum*, saith, *Valentia tom. 3. disp. 6. quæst. 7. punct. 3.* Legerdemaine in vendition, *ubi quantum & quale mutatur*, may be venial, *si materia sit levis*, saith *Tolet. de 7. pecc. cap. 49.* whereas diverse measures, without exception, are declared abomination, *Pro. 20. 10.* All these remedies which they apply after death, make men less diligent in dutie while they live. And if *Purgatory* be the Popes peculiar, as they call it, he must have little love to Souls, and too much to his own gain, who will not release those Prisoners sooner, and fill some rooms in Heaven faster? How readie are we to delay duty from time to time? And doth not this baite our humour? How jejune and bare is their contrition, which goeth before confession and absolution? Yet may prove sufficient. Hear *Suarez tom. 4. disp. 4.* who saith *a slender grief is sufficient.* And *Tolet. lib. 3. de instr. Sacerdot. a small degree of grief, can wipe away a great degree of sin.* What is this but daubing with untempered morter, and putting kercheises under arme holes, a strengthening of the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his evil way? *By toleration of Brothels, and preferring in votaries fornication to lawful marriage*; Is not a wide door opened to obscene sensualitie? *Agrippa de vanit.* witnesseth, that the Pope hath tribute payed to him by all the whore-houses at *Rome*. Therefore *Pope Sixtus* builded the *nobile lupanar*, a notable Brothel

house. *Bell. de Monach. lib. 2. cap.* 30. saith, *that fornication in such is a less sin nor marriage.* What will debauch the chastitie if this do not? *Tolet. lib. 4. de instr. sacerd.* telleth us, *that a man is bound to sanctifie the Sabbath, but is not bound to sanctifie it well, for he may hunt, travel, and make markets on that day.* Is not this infectious doctrine? Now Christian Reader, if thou be serious for salvation, I charge thee to pause here a little, and consider if this can be the way of holiness, wherein the Prophets, Apostles, and primitive Fathers walked to Heaven? Therefore as thou tendereſt thy own salvation and consolation, bewar of it, this leadeth to the chambers of death. Hath saine man who enclineth naturally to wickednes need of such incentives to sin, and lenitives when he hath sinned? Or can he who is of purer eyes then to behold iniquity, approve such as break his Commandments, and teach men so to do? Can the tree be good where the fruit is so bad? None will believe it who have understanding, unless they be willing to be deceived. It is the stain of any Christian, to desert the good old way in which they are commanded to walk, *Jer.* 6. 16. and to be fooled out of their Religion, by some groundless distinctions, and ingenious devices of subtile men, who stent snares, and lay themselves in waite to deceive the simple. If a man born and trained in the Reformed Church shal hanker after Popery, he is foolish in so doing, if he purpose not to swallow the whole bulk of it. For *Bellarmin* saith,

they cannot quite one jota, otherwise their Church were not to be reputed infallible; and if he resolve to do this, I must say he hath an Ostrich-stomach, and is a great latitudinarian. Further it is to be feared that at the next alteration, if tempted, he fall into Atheism, & total infidelitie. For the weapõs by which the Papists wage warre with the Scriptures, and the Reformed Church built thereon, are the same which *Celsus* used of old against Christianity it self, which *Origen* refuteth at length, he impeached the Scriptures, and quarrelled the Christians for their rents, for the calumnies of the world, &c. If these have beat thee from the Reformed Religion, hast thou not to fear, that they may shake thee in all, and turn thee at last Nullifidian? As they make use of Pagan arguments, so of the Jewish, for they reasoned just so against Christ Jesus and his Apostles. By what authority? where is your visible succession? have any of the rulers, Scribes or Pharisees beleeved on him? *&c.* It hath pleased the Lord to furnish us with good defences, but it is strange, that they drawing many of their shafts from Pagan, and Jewish Antichristian quivers, should not be ashamed of their way. And it is more strange, that knowing men if conscientious, should be ensnared by them. It is known to such as are not ignorant of Church history, that when Christianity came first into this Ysle, they had nothing to do with Rome, for a long time they were strangers and adversaries to her soveraignty, and would not exchange the dyet of Easter for her

commands, nor have communion with these messengers, who came from her. *Bede* called *Venerable* telleth *lib. 2. hist. cap. 4.* that in the beginning of the 7. *cent.* after *Augustine the Monk* came to *Britain*, he found them no way like the *Romanists*, nor could he prevaile with them, to conforme to *Rome*, not so much as in the administration of Baptism, or observation of Easter. And when one *Laurentius* his successor endeavoured the same, and thought the Scots would be more tractable, he found the plaine contrare: as he writeth to the Abbates in Scotland, for *Dagamus* the Scotish Bishop, who came to speak with them, refused to eat or drink with *Laurentius*, or stay in the roome where he was. So little communion would they here have then with Romanists. Now that Church is farre more corrupt, then it was in *Gregories* dayes, and ours more pure and enlightened then it was at that time. What phreneſie must it be therefore in them now who are members of this Church, to enter into communion with Romanists, or tamper with, or haunker after their way. Let all who love the Truth stand in awe thus to sin, we have a safer surer way for Salvation nor Popery, wherein if we walk, peace and mercy shal be on us, *Gal. 6. 16.*

Least this Preface swell disproportionably, I will offer four advyces to my Countrey-men, that they may be perswaded from Poperie; and then close with a word more particularly to the Inhabitants of this Place.

First, If ye would guard well against Popery, have

a full perſwaſion of the Truth, from the ground of divine revelation, in the holy Scriptures. 2. *Tim.* 1. 13. 14. *Hold faſt the forme of ſound words, which thou haſt heard of me, in faith and love, which is in Chriſt Ieſus, that good thing which is commited to thee, keep by the holy Ghoſt which dwelleth in us.* For men not perſwaded by divine faith, like to young ſcholars, evil grounded in their principles are eaſily put from their grounds, and toſſed to and froe with every wind of doctrine: *Perſuaſiſti mihi Domine* ſaith *Aug. lib. 6. confeſ. cap.* 5. this keeped him faſt. When once divine Truth ſinketh into the heart, ye will have a ſincere love to it for it ſelf, and not for any by reſpects or worldly advantages. Otherwayes when truth ſlotteth only in the head, and men are bated with worldly temptations, and ſelfiſh intereſts, they are ſoon drawn away from the truth, which in their affection is poſtponed to that which they love better. And GOD in his holy juſtice giveth them up to ſtronge deluſions for their hypocriſie, and want of ſinceritie, 2. *Theſſ.* 2. 10. 11. the Lord hath promiſed the ſpirit to them who ask him, *Luke* 11. 13. If ye love the truth, ſeek the grace and ſtrength of the holy Spirit to lead you into all truth, and labour to grow in grace, and the knowledge of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, following diligently the means appointed thereto by GOD himſelf, to wit, reading, hearing the Word preached, receiving the holy Sacrament of the Supper, as GOD ſhal give opportunitie, meditation, prayer, ſpiritual conference, *Hoſea* 6. 3.

2. *Peter* 3. 17. Beware of looſeneſs and all prophanneſs in converſation, for it is righteouſneſs with GOD to puniſh practical Atheiſts, by giving them over to ſpeculative Atheiſme, whereby they are hardened in their wicked courſes; And ſilly women led away with diverſe luſtes are eaſie led captive, and detained in errour by ſeducers, whoſe doctrine hath complyance with their looſe way of living, 2. *Tim.* 3. 6.

Secondly, Beware of prejudice againſt reformed Miniſters or Profeſſours, where this entereth it maketh the evil eye, and if the eye be evil, the whole body is dark, *Matth.* 6. 23. Some alleadge that the pupil of a Witch eye is inverted by malice. Certainly the underſtanding of any man is in hazard to be thus perverted. That which made *Porphyre*, *Iulian*, and other Apoſtats fall away from the truth, was θυμὸς καὶ ἐπιθυμία *prejudice and paſſion*. It is reported of an *Indian*, that being wronged by the *Spaniard*, when ſome were inſtructing him about Chriſtianity, and the way to Heaven, he refuſed to be a Chriſtian, becauſe he heard that the *King of Spain* was walking in that path; in this he was Pagan like. Let Chriſtians be aſhamed to ſpeak or do ſo. If men in this controverſal age, have done or ſuffered injuries, for the Lords ſake let none of theſe things make you wronge the truth of GOD, your own conſciences, or the Mother Church, which did bear or foſter you. Alace, what evil hath the Goſpel of Chriſt done to you? Wherein hath it wearied you, whoſe Oxe or Aſs hath it taken, teſtifie againſt it if ye dare? Why then

then will ye wronge the Maſter for the Servants ſake, and hate the truth, becauſe ye love not ſome who profeſs to adhere to it? Is it imaginable that ſuch back-ſliding courſes will afford you comfort in the end of the day, when the ſilver corde is looſed, and the pitcher broken at the well? Were it a good defence for treaſon, to ſay to a King, *ſome fellow ſubjects have wronged me.* How eaſily might he return this, *ſhal ye therefore wrong my law? It may be your wronge is ſuppoſed not real, and admit it be ſo indeed, two blacks makes not one white, ye ſhould remember the oath of alleagiance.* So will the King of Kings challenge Apoſtats, and ſay, *why departed ye from the truth? Was this the way to right your wronges, whereunto was ye baptized? Why gadde ye abroad to change your way?* This is baſeneſs belovv a Chriſtian or any man of honour.

Thirdly, Let all lovers of truth love one another dearly, and entertaine the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace; This is a fence againſt foes, forbear and forgive one another, let the ſtronge bear with the weak, and if in all things ye cannot be like minded, (which is rather to be wiſhed nor expected here) yet be kindly affectioned. *And whereunto ye have attained walk by the ſame rule, and if in any thing ye be otherwiſe minded, the Lord will reveal that in due time, and teach you that which ye ſee not.* When breaches are amongſt ſincere Chriſtians, who fear the Lord and his goodneſs, the adverſarie who waiteth for their halting, caſteth oyle on the flame, and with

jeering

jeering warmeth his hands at the fire. All the wilde beasts of the wildernes, enter in at those breaches, and are readie to take away the wine-press, and devour with open mouth the tender Vines. *Josephus de Bello Judaico*, telleth us, that the *Romans* of old overcame *Jerusalem* easily, because the chief Captaines within the walls fought eagerly amongst themseves, and were so divided by the wrath of GOD, that their animositie was greater against other, nor the common adversarie; this prepared the way for their sudden overthrow. And when the Roman Eagles did flee to BRITTAIN, the Historian *Tacitus* sheweth, how they in this Isle were vanquished, *dum singuli pugnant universi vincuntur*. Little was left undone to the adversaries hand. So the new Romanists take the same advantage against our *Jerusalem*; therfore we should be the more diligent to endeavour by all Christian wayes, that peace may be within her wals, and prosperity within her palaces. It would be well adverted that the enemie is at the gates, therefore should be watchfully eyed in all our deportment. Every time hath its own tryal and temptation, the dispensation of this sinful time calleth for much consideration; and they who understand the language of it, may excel amongst their brethren, and serve the generation best in the fear of the Lord. The Christians in *Persia* saith *Thuod lib. 5. hist. cap. 38.* understood not the times wherein they lived, therefore became a prey to their adversaries, let not the enemie get advantage, least it be told in *Gath* and

Askelon

Askelon. It was said of old amongst Pagans, behold the Christians how they love one another, and their adversaries were forced to commend them, for sweet harmeless carriage. This is an ornament to profession, and a guarde to the truths of the Gospel. Therefore as ye tender the honour of the Lord, and preservation of his truth, live in love; love the truth and peace, follow peace and holiness, this will at least damp adversaries.

Fourthly, Labour to know experimentally the power of Christian Religion, nothing will more solidly refute Poperie to you, nor the kingdom of grace in power. Poperie is a humane device, full of pompous shadows, which hath no concord with the light and life of the Gospel. For the more shadow the less light. The Northern-people from whom the Sun is remote, are circled with shadows: but these who have the Sun perpendicularly over them, and are under it at the Noone-tyde, have little or no shadow. So, if ye would decline the Popish groves, live near the Sun of righteousness. The Popish trash cannot please a reformed Christian. Holy *Augustin ep.* 119. complaineth that in his time the Church was pressed, contrar to the merciful institution of Christ, with such a servile burthen of ceremonies, that the state of the Jews under the Law, was more tolerable nor the condition of Christians, seeing they were subject to the ordinances of GOD, and not to humane presumptions. If he had now lived and seen their gadre way, what would he have said? Surely,

this, that the Romish Church is full of shadows, therefore far from the Sun. The best refutation of some points of Arminianisme, is the power and efficacie of Gospel grace on the heart. Will ever that man believe Free-will in its extent, as it is taught by them to whom the Lord hath spoken with an high hand, and determined for his duties? No verily! Or will any of the Circumcision who worship GOD in spirit, rejoyce in Christ Jesus, and put no confidence in the flesh; Be delighted with a burdensom bounde of humane inventions, or place worship in these? It cannot be, such will consider *Matth.* 15. 9. and so accounr that worship vain. The Merchants have not alwayes the best shops who hang forth pompous signs. Nor is she reputed a chaste woman, who is fearded in the face, and cloathed with the attire of an harlot. The whorish garbe of *Rome*, will not readily please souls espoused to that one Husband *Jesus Christ*, therefore live like the Gospel. And if ye be sealed by it to the day of Redemption, with the holy Spirit of promise, the Scripture truths will be precious to you. That which rendreth many unstable is a notional *Cartesian* way of Religion; but sincere Christians have not so learned Christ. If thou once taste how good the Lord is, and if he hath given thee songs in the night, his testimonies to thee will be more then thy necessarie food. Irreligious prophanesse and Popery are practically so sibb to other, that the one usshereth in the other. Nothing maketh me fear the growth of this bitter root in the Land more,

Gen.

then the deludge of prophanneſs, which overfloweth all the banks. When men belie their Chriſtian profeſſion, *being abominable, diſobedient, and to every good work reprobat.* Is it not to be feared, that the Lord make ſuch like *Shiloh, Ier.* 7. 17. live then holily and righteouſly. *If ye do his will ye ſhal know the doctrine whither it be of GOD or not, John* 7. 17. Godlineſs hath the promiſes of this life, and of that which is to come; it is not much to be feared that many (if any) who have taſted of the power of Religion by the ordinances of the Reformed Church, will turne away to Popery; That ſeal on the heart will prove a notable preſervative.

I ſhal conclude this Preface with a word of advertiſement to the Inhabitants of *Dundee*, whom I dearly love, and have in my heart frequently before the Lord. That ſeeing the Lord hath made you one of the conſiderable incorporations in this Nation, ye would conſecrate your gaine to him, by proving valiant for his truth on earth, it is not unknown how the Lord honoured this place, by making an early proffer of the Goſpel to it, by that faithful Servant and Martyr of Chriſt, *Mr. George Wiſhart* who preached the Goſpell here, and edified many by his powerfull preaching. One *Robert Milne* who had then ſway in the Tovvn, to pleaſe that *Cardinal Beton*, by vvhom he vvas corrupted and byaſſed with bribes, as our Eccleſiaſtick Hiſtorians tell, discharged the faithful ſervant of Chriſt, from preaching in the Tovvn any more, to vvhom he replyed, *I ſhall re-*

move, but if it be long well with you I am not led by the spirit of truth: and if unexpected trouble fall on you, remember this is the cause of it; Turne then to God by repentance, for he is mercifull. This vvord was verified, for within four days after his departure, the plague of pestilence break up here. Then sent they for him as sick men do for a Phisitian, who returning comforted the unthankful people vvho shut him out; Preached on the East-port, on that text *Psalm* 107. v. 20. *he sent his word and healed them*, shortly thereafter the plague ceased. The Word of GOD backed by prophecie, and providence did take so deep impression on the people, that they became eminent promoters of the vvork of Reformation. And for ought that I can learn from that time or thereabout Poperie decayed so in this place, that none avouched it till the year 1662. then some three or four did break out to the great scandal of the Congregation. Novv the case and state of the question being the same vvhich vvas then, if ye fall out of love vvith the truth, vvrath vvill be upon you, and as ye vvould not meet vvith a vvrathful stroak, cleave to the Gospel vvith full purpose of heart. If any shal do othervvise (vvhich the Lord forbid) such vvill degenerate from their vvorthie Predecessours, and vvandring from mountain to hill, vvill finde no resting place. As no place in the Land, hath been more free of Poperie for a long time, so none have suffered more for loyaltie to our Soveraigne the Kings Majestie. Was not your blood spilt like vvater?

Your

Your houses rifled and possessed by usurping strangers? Yet ye who survive the rest, are as brands plucked out of the fire, preserved by the *Lord*. If after such stroaks, messages, messengers, deliverances, preservations, ye do countenance or foster Poperie, and fall away from the truth of GOD. Will it not be bitterness in the latter end? Who encline so, let them read *Ezra* 9. 14. and make application. A word is enough to the wise. There have been sundry faithful Messengers of Christ here since the Reformation, who warned the place frequently, who battered *Babylon*, and builded *Zion*. And if the tares of Adversaries should pester this field again; these Messengers now at their rest, will stand up and witness against this place in one day. And this testimony shal be indorsed against you. *That ye are lawfully warned to save your selves from the evil of this generation.* Reader where ever thou dwellest, consider well what is said here, *buy the truth and sell it not.* And the Lord give thee understanding in all things which belong to thy Peace in this thy day; this is heartily desired by a lover of the truth and doctrine which is according to Godliness.

FAREVVEL.

Sithence our Confession and the Grecian Confession of Faith is here mentioned, I thought it expedient to prefixe the Greek, because every Reader will not probably have it at hand. That therefore it may appear

pear to all, what consent our doctrine hath of old and of late, and how numerous the Professours thereof, be at home and abroad this is adjoyned. So that Adversaries can neither justly load us with noveltie of tenets, or paucitie of adherents: and he who will peruse both Confessions, may easily convince them of their errour. I thought to have set down the intire Confession in the Greek language, but the Printer finding a defect of typs, the beginning of each Article and distinct period is set down in Greek. And a faithful translation of it in the English language is subjoyned, this translation was Printed at London *diverse years since.*

Ανατολικη ομολογια της χριστιανικης πιστεως.

The Eastern Confession of the Christian faith.

Εις το ονομα του πατρος και του υιου και του αγιου πνευματος.

In the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY-GHOST.

Πιστευομεν ενα θεον &c. *We believe one GOD Almightie and infinite, three in Persons, the* Father, Son, *and* Holy Ghost; *the Father unbegotten, the Son begotten of the Father befor the World, consubstantial with the Father: the holy Ghost proceeding from the Father by the Son, having the same*

essence with the Father and the Son, we call these three Persons in one essence, the holy Trinity, ever to be blessed, glorified, and to be worshipped of every creature.

Πιστεύομεν τὴν ἱερὰν γραφὴν &c. *We believe the holy* Scripture *to be given by GOD, to have no other author but the Holy Ghost, which we ought undoubtedly to believe: for it is written, We have a more sure word of Prophecie, to the which ye do well to take heed, as to a light shining in a darke place. Besides, we believe the* authoritie *thereof to be above the authority of the Church. It is a farr different thing for the holy Ghost to speake and the tongue of man, for the tongue of man may through ignorance erre, deceive, and be deceived; but the Word of GOD neither deceieveth, nor is deceived, nor can erre, but is alwayes infallible and sure.*

Πιστεύομεν τὸν ἄκρως &c. *We believe that the best and greatest GOD hath* predestinated *his Elect unto glory before the beginning of the world, without any respect unto their workes, and that there was no other impulsive cause to this election, but only the good will and mercy of GOD. In like manner before the world was made he hath rejected whom he would: of which act of reprobation, if you consider the absolute dealing of GOD, his will is the cause, but if ye look upon GODS orderly proceeding, his justice is the cause, for GOD is merciful and just.*

Πιστεύομεν τὸν ῥισυπόστατον θεόν, &c. *We believe that one GOD in Trinity, the Father, Son, and holy Ghost, to be the* Creator *of all things visible and invisible: Invisible things we call the Angels, visible things the Heavens*

Heavens and all things under them. And because the Creatour is good by nature, he hath created all things good, and cannot do any evil: and if there be any evil, it proceedeth from the Devil and man: for it ought to be a certain rule to us, that GOD is not the authour of evil, neither can any sin by any just reason be imputed to him.

Πιστευομεν τα παντα &c. *We believe that all things are governed by GODS Providence, which we ought rather to adore then search into, sith it is beyond our capacitie, neither can we truely understand the reason of it from the things themselves; in which matter we suppose it better to embrace silence in humilitie, then to speak many things which do not edifie.*

Πιστευομεν τον πρωτον &c. *We believe that the first man created by God, fell in Paradise, because neglecting the Commandment of GOD, he yeelded to the deceitful counsel of the Serpent; from thence sprung up Original sin to his posteritie, so that no man is borne according to the flesh, who doth not bear his burthen, and feel the fruits of it in his life.*

πιστευομεν τον υιον &c. *We believe that the Son of God our Lord Iesus Christ hath made himself of no account, that is,* hath assumed mans nature *into his own Subsistence, that he was conceived by the Holy Ghost, that he was made man in the womb of* Mary *always a Virgin, was born and suffered death, was buried, and glorified by his resurrection, that he brought salvation and glorie to all Believers, whom we look for to come to judge both quick and dead.*

We

πιστευομεν &c. *We believe that our Lord* Iesus Christ *sitteth at the right hand of his Father, and there maketh intercession for us, executing alone the office of a true and lawful* Priest *and* Mediatour: *and from thence he hath a care of his people, and governeth his Church, adorning and enriching her with many blessings.*

πιστευομεν &c. *We believe that without* Faith *no man can be saved, but that we call Faith, which in* Christ Iesus *justifieth, which the life and death of our Lord* Iesus Christ *procured, the Gospel published, and without which no man can please* GOD.

πιστευομεν &c. *We believe that the Church (which is called* Catholick) *containeth all true believers in Christ, which being departed, are in their Country in Heaven, or living on earth, are yet travelling in the way: the* Head of which Church, *(because a mortal man by no means can be)* Iesus Christ *is the Head alone, and he holdeth the sterne of the Government of the Church in his own hand: but because on earth there be particular visible Churches, and in order every one of them hath one chief, which chief is not properly to be called a head of that particular Church, but improperly, because he is the principal member thereof.*

πιστευομεν &c. *We believe that the Members of the Catholick Church be the Saints, chosen unto eternal life from the number & fellowship of which, Hypocrits are excluded, though in particular visible Churches, Tares may be found amongst the Wheat.*

πιστευομεν &c. *We believe that the*

Church *on earth in the way is sanctified and instructed by the* Holy Ghost, *for he is the true Comforter, whom Christ sendeth from the Father, to teach the truth and to expel darkness from the understanding of the Faithful. For it is very certaine, that the* Church of GOD may erre, taking falshood for truth: *from which errour, the light and doctrine of the holy Spirit alone freeth us, not of mortal man, although by Mediation of the labours of the Churches Ministers this may be done.*

πιστεύομεν πίστει δικαιοῦσθαι &c. *We beleeve* that a man is justified by faith, *and not by workes: but when we say, by Faith, we understand the correlative or object of Faith, which is the righteousness of Christ, which Faith apprehends and applyeth unto us for our salvation. This may verily be, and yet without any prejudice to good workes: for Truth it self teacheth us that workes must not be neglected, that they be necessary means, and testimonies of our Faith, for confirmation of our calling; but for* workes *to be sufficient for our salvation and to make a man so to appear before the Tribunal of Christ, that of condignity or merit they conferre salvatiõ, humane frailty witnesseth to be false, but the* righteousness of Christ *being applyed to the penitent, doth onely justifie and save the Faithful.*

πιστεύομεν ἐν τοῖς &c. *We believe that* free-will *is dead in the unregenerate, because they can do no good thing, and whatsoever they do is sin; but in the regenerate by the grace of the holy Spirit, the will is excited, and indeed worketh, but not without the assistance*

of

of grace: to effect that therefore which is good, grace goeth before the will, which will in the regenerated is wounded, as he by the thieves that came from Ierusalem, so that of himself without the help of grace, he hath no power to do any thing.

πιστευομεν τὰ εὐαγγελικὰ &c. We believe that there be Evangelicall Sacraments in the Church, which the Lord hath instituted in the Gospel, and they be two: we have no larger number of Sacraments, because the Ordayner thereof delivered no more. Furthermore we believe, that they consist of the Word and the Elements, that they be seals of the promises of GOD, and we doubt not, but do conferre grace. But that the Sacrament be intire and whole, it is requisit that an earthly substance and an external action do concurre with the use of that element ordained by Christ our Lord, and joyned with a true faith, because the defect of faith doth prejudice the integrity of the Sacrament.

πιστευομεν τὸ βάπτισμα &c. We believe that Baptism is a Sacrament instituted by the Lord, which unless a man hath received, he hath not cõmunion with Christ, from whose death, burial, and glorious Resurrection, the whole vertue and efficacy of Baptism doth proceed. Therefore in the same forme wherein our LORD hath cõmanded in the Gospel we are certain that to those who be Baptized both Original and Actual sins are pardoned: so that whosoever have been washed, In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, are regenerate cleansed & justified. But concerning the repetitiõ of it, we have no cõmand to Re-bap-

tised therfore we must abstaine from this incõvenience.

Πιστευομεν το ἐθεον &c. *We beleeve that the other Sacrament was ordained of the Lord which we call the* Eucharist. *For in the night wherein he was betrayed, taking bread and blessing it, he said to his Apostles, Take ye, eat, this is my Body: and when he had taken the Cup, he gave thanks and said, Drinke ye all of this, this is my Blood which was shed for many; do this in remembrance of me. And* Paul *addeth, for as often as ye shall eat of this Bread and drinke of this Cup, ye do shew the Lords death: this is the pure and lawful institution of this wonderful Sacrament, in administration whereof we confess and profess a* true and real presence *of* Christ *our* Lord, *but yet such an one as* Faith *offereth to us, not such as devised* Transubstantiation *teacheth. For we believe, the faithful do eat the Body of Christ in the supper of the Lord, not by breaking it with the teeth of the Body, but by perceiving it with the sense & feeling of the Soul sith the Body of Christ is not that which is visible in the Sacrament, but that which* Faith spiritually *apprehendeth, and offereth to us: from whence it is true that if we believe, we do eat and partake; if we do not believe, we are destitute of all the fruit of it. We believe consequently, that to drink the Cup in the Sacrament, is to be partaker of the true Blood of our Lord Iesus Christ, in the same manner as we affirmed of the Body: for as the Authour of it commanded concerning his Body, so he did concerning his Blood: which commandment ought neither to be dismembred nor maymed*

according to the fancy of mans arbitrement; yea rather the institution ought to be kept as it was delivered to us. When therefore we have been partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ worthily, and have communicated intirely, we acknowledge our selves to be reconciled, united to our head of the same Body, with certaine hope to be coheires in the Kingdome to come.

Πιστευομεν τας της κεκοιμημενων &c. *We believe that the Soules of the dead are either in blessednes, or in damnation, according as every one hath done: for as soon as they remove out of the Body they passe either to Christ, or into hell; for as a man is found at his death, so he is judged, and after this life there is neither power nor opportunity to repent. In this life there is a time of Grace, they therefore who be justified here shal suffer no punishment hereafter: but they who being not justified do dye, are appointed for everlasting punishments. By which it is evident that the fiction of Purgatory is not to be admitted, but in the truth it is determined, that every one ought to repent in this life, and to obtaine remission of his sins by our Lord Jesus Christ, if he will be saved. And let this be the end.*

Την συντομον ταυτην ὁμολογιαν &c. This compendious and brief Confession of us we conjectur will be a contradiction to them, who are pleased to slander, maliciously accuse us, and unjustly persecute us: But we trust in our Lord Jesus Christ, and hope that he will not relinquish the cause of his faithful ones, nor let the rod of wickednes ly upon the lot of the righteous.

Dated in Constantinople, in the Month of March, 1629.

CYRILL, Patriarch of Constantinople.

Courteous Reader, thy favour is desired in some escapes of the Press, these which are but literal not altering the sense, pardon and pass by; these which are more gross amend as followeth.

In Epist. Ded. Page 5. *Line* 10. *Read* callida: *l* 20 *for* way hold, *Read*, waxe bold. *In the Epistle to the Reader, p.* 8. *l.* 2. *for* Church *r.* Christ. *p.* 16. *l. ult for* the, *r.* there. *p.* 18. *l.* 12. *for* calumnies *r.* calamities. *page* 19. *line.* 27. *for* perswaded, *read*, disswaded. *page* 21. *line.* 17. *for* δι *r.* κατ. *p.* 26. *l.* 5. *for* 17 *r.* 14. *In the Debate, p.* 8. *l.* 13. *for*, although all, *r.* Apocryphal *p* 19. *l antep. del.* lay. *p.* 33 *l. ult. r.* proceed, *p.* 34. *l.* 17 *for* Paliner *r.* Parmen. *p* 37 *l.* 21 *for* a *r.* the. *p.* 46 *l. antep. r.* Praxeam. *p.* 48 *l.* 6. *r.* conjuncta. *p.* 69. *l.* 25. *for* tradition *r.* citation. *p.* 88. *l.* 23. *r.* lament. *p.* 103. *l* 20. *del.* Thirdly. *p.* 107. *l.* 2. *r* mortalitate. *p* 121. *l.* 13. *r.* were made. *p.* 129. *l.* 18. *r.* breasts. *p.* 130. *l.* 19. *for* of *r.* in. *p.* 138 *l.* 19. *r.* statue. *p.* 160. *l.* 9. *for* according to, *r.* accordingly. *p* 161 *l. penult. r.* non continentur. *p.* 175. *from l.* 10. *to* 17. *read all that period in* ( ) *p.* 177. *l.* 1. *for*, that *r.* not. *p.* 234. *l.* 20 *adde*, or as some. 23. *p.* 268. *l* 23. *r.* let them testifie. *p.* 270. *l.* 25. *r.* comminations. *p.* 284. *l.* 17. *r* in company. *p.* 284. *l* 5. *r.* none can.

In some copies though but in few, there will be found these errours, in Ep. Ded. p. 2 Peope *for* Pope. *p.* 3. *l.* 9. Sacraments *for* Sacrament. *l.* 20. modestly and humbly, *for* modestie, humilitie. *p.* 4. *l.* 17. underminding *for* undermining. *l.* 18. teares *for* tares, *in pref. of the Greek Confession, twise* δι *for* κατ.

If any testimonies be repeated, that is to be imputed to the Impunger, not to the Defender.

A DIALOGUE,

Betwixt a *Papist* and a reformed PROFESSOUR, who protesteth against the Errours of *Popery*; written for information of the Simple, who love the truth, that they be not ensnared by the temptations of the time.

PAPIST. QUESTION I.

SEeing this *Age is so controversall, how shall it be discerned who hath the Truth?*

PROTESTANT *Answer.*

A By the Scriptures. The written word of God is the only infallible determiner of faith and manners. It hath divine Authority, heavenly Majesty, to a right discerner, it maketh spirituall impressions on the soul, to it as chief judge on

Earth all [illegible]cals should be made, *Isa.* 8. 16. *To the Law and the Testimony.*

Papists Reply.

To this Answere, a Papist replyeth, that it is not satisfying; and rendereth five reasons, why the Scripture cannot be the determiner of faith and manners. First, Because the chief and greatest Controversie is about scripture it self, viz. What be the scripture, what not? Now if it be the determiner of faith, as you speak, in [illegible] is the Catalogue of Canonical bookes [illegible]? How may it be proved against Luth[illegible] that St. Iames his Epistle is Canonical [illegible] now against others that Nicodemus *and* S. Thomas *Gospells are not? Or, if you reject* Tobias, Judith, *the bookes of Wisdom,* Ecclesiasticus *and the* Maccabees, *because the Synagogue of the Iewes did so, why do you not also deny Christ to be the Messias with them?*

Protest. Reply.

Answer. This return is rather an evasion, then solid reply, and is satisfied in the resolution of the sixt Question, to which in reason it ought to be referred; yet seing tumultuously diverse things are here heaped together I shall sort and discuss them thus. First, There is no Christian Church which maketh it a Controversie at all, whether scripture be the word of God? so this is not the chiefest and greatest Controvesie: for it is supposed amongst the principles of Christianity, and if the

the *Præcognita* of other sciences have, *ex terminis*, their own notoreiety, (& we should not argument, *contra negantes principia*, against them who deny known principles) how can this be denyed to Theology? seing, if we rest not on some principles we must run our selves out of breath, and not know where to fist. *Basil* † telleth that, as in every science, there be unquestionable principles, which are beleeved without further demonstration, so in the science of sacred things *Theology*, This is amongst τας αρχας, that scripture is the word of God, if any impugne this controversall, he is an Antiscripturist and Paganish. Secondly, There be no Controversie, betwixt us and the Papists, in that wherein we are agreed, but both are agreed that all the bookes which we receive for Canonicall scripture, are the word of God, *Ergo* this is no Controversie. If all the bookes of scripture which we maintaine be the word of God, our Adversaries being judges, then it must determine faith and manners, or else our faith is humane, for *Bellarmine* † sayeth, that *Scriptura est regula credendi infallibilissima & certissima*, the written word is a most sure and certaine rule of beleeving. So sayeth *Aquinas* †. This is sufficient for confirming the first *Answere*, and refuting the first *Exception*. Yet, to follow your impertinent digres-

† *Basil in Psal.* 115.

† *Bel. verbo Dei lib.* 1. c. 2.

† *Aquinas in* 2. *Tim.* 6.

sion, from the power of the *Scripture*-bench, to the number of the books. 2 *I Answere Secondly*, that the doctrine, concerning the number of the *Scripture* books, or the names of all them who penned these, if *comparatively* considered, that is, if you compare the present number with that of the Jewish and ancient Church in p[rimi]tive times of Christianity, is not *explicite* known and beleeved by all, *Fide divina* Christ; but we come to the knowledge of the number, which the primitive Church maintained, as we doe to the names and number of other bookes, seing the Catalogue of Canonicall bookes is not set down in scripture. All this we attaine without the aid of Romish Councills. For the *Jewes* to whom were committed the oracles of God, *Rom.* 3. 1. 2. whom holy *Augustin* on *Ps.* 40. calleth *Capsarios & librarios Christianorum*, these who keeped the bookes of the old Testament for Christians, and fulfilled, as he saith, that word in part, *The elder shall serve the younger*, divide the bookes of the old Testament, according to the letters of their Alphabet into two and twenty, sometimes into foure and twenty, as *Eusebius* sheweth, yet never added to, nor altered a book of the Canon; only they would sume up now and then the book of *Ruth* with the *Judges*, the book of the *Lamentations*

Lib. 3. *cap.* 10.

with

with the Prophecies of *Jeremy*, and at other times againe, reckon them by themselves: So they sometimes made but one book of *Samuel*, one of the *Kings*, one of the *Chronicles*, in some editions the whole *Minor Prophets* were reckoned but one book, by them. As the scription and writting of the bible is, and hath been diverse, yet the doctrine contained therein, is stil the rule under every character: so the Canon of the old Testament finished by the Prophet *Malachy*, was ever the same in the *Jewish Church*, what ever way they calculated the number of these bookes. *Hierom* translated the books of the old Testamēt from the Hebrew, and he did admit all the books admitted by us. So did the Greek and Latine Church, neither for ought we can learn from Authors, was there any alteration or addition till the third Council of *Carthage* then *Can.* 47. they recōmended other books as profitable to be read, which are Apocryphal. The Canon of the New Testament was finished by *Iohn* the Evangelist, who outlived the rest of the Apostles, and the number, we have not disclaimed, *In universa ecclesia Christiana*, sayeth *Hierom ad Dardanum*. And, according to the Councill of *Laodicea Can.* 59. these books were numbered as *Canonick* only, and appointed to be readin all the Churches of Syria, this Coun-

cill

still was holden *Anno Dom.* 364.

Although *Luther* cast at the Epistle of *James* we receive it. Secondly, *Luther* by some Learned, is said to have made a retractation of that errour. Thirdly, In his Preface to his works he desireth that men would read his books with some commiseration, and remember that once he was a Monk. Fourthly, Your own *Cajetan* said as much against the Epistle of *James* as *Sixtus Senensis* telleth us *Biblioth. lib.* 6. will it therefore follow that ye have no Canon? Fifthly, *Stapleton* saith, *Princ. doct. lib.* 9. *cap.* 14. *& in Defens. Eccl. Author*: that it is not as yet peremptorily defined by your Church, whither ye may adde moe books to the present number? but, we of the reformed Church are agreed in this, that these books of the Old and New Testament number them who wil, were the Canon received, read, and exponed in the Primitive Church, and none can adde to or alter the doctrine therein contained, under the pain of *Anathema*, *Rev.* 22. 19. It is an admirable providence that the *Jews* such enemies to *Christianity*, keeped these Prophesies of the Scripture uncorrupted. So saith holy *Augustin lib. de Consensu Evang. cap.* 26. yet you deride that, as if the Lord could not keep that holy Canon in the *Jews* hand which is a witness against them, and testifies of him to

their

their confusion. *Jo.* 5. 39. so your consequence is bad and impertinent.

Answer. Third. Although the *numbering*, or *penning* of the *Scripture* books, (*comparatively* considered) be not simply necessary to be known, or believed, *fide Divina*. But we come to the knowledge of these as to the *number* or *penner* of other books: yet *absolutly* considered, to any discerner the books of *Scripture* father themselves. *Lege in facie κριτηρια Divina*, read in the face of them divine approbation, as in the Firmament we may see the finger of GOD, so here † we may behold divine Majestie, Heavenly efficacie, the consent and harmonie of parts the fulfilling of Prophesies, see *August. lib. 6. Confes. cap. 5. Persuasisti mihi non qui crederent libros tuos, quos, tanta in omnibus fere gentibus authoritate, fundasti, sed qui non crederent, esse culpandos: nec audiendos esse, si qui forte mihi dicerent, unde scis illos libros unius veri Dei spiritu esse humano generi administratos? id ipsum maxime credendum erat.* The Scripture it self then testifieth whose it is, holy men of GOD did so speak and writ that ye may know the certainty of these things, *Luk.* 1. 4. and believe them, *Jo.* 19. 35. this is taken from the very Scripture, and not from any distinct Tradition from it. Beside all this, we have miracles

3:

† See *Barron against Turnbul tract. 9. p. 643.*

wonderful

wonderful providences sealing this word; the testimonie of adversaries, *Jews* and *Gentiles* to the doctrine therein contained, the testimonie of old and late writters to our whole Canon. And seeing the Lord hath sealed it, and it is called his *Testament*; none should adde to it, or alter any point contained therein. This is expresly forbidden *Deut.* 4. 2. 12. 32. *Pro.* 3. 6. how grosly *Papists* make void the *Testament* of the Lord by new *datives*, and in that are like the *Pharisees*; *Matth.* 15. 3. 6. shal appear hereafter.

4

† *The Papists reject some of these Apocriphal books from the Canon of Scripture, as Esdras, the book of Baruch &c.*

Answer fourth, Although all books †are not reiected by us upon this account only because the *Iews* did so, but for many other good reasons; for, *self-murder* is commended in *Razis* there, contrar to the 6. Command, &c. The authours crave pardon for that which is spoken amiss, wherby it is acknowledged that they had not the spirit of infallibility; in all ages, exceptions were made against them as is well proved by our Divines, *S. Thomas* and *Nicodemus Gospels* have approbation of none, so need no refutation. Now I referre it to any Reader whither this first reason be sufficiently refuted, or if this reflecter understandeth Logick, or himself who thus reasoneth, The number of Scripture books is

controverted

controverted, therefore that which on all hands betwixt PROTESTANTS and *Papists*, is acknowledged to be Scripture is not the determiner of faith. Who will not perceive here a mis-stated question and gross non-consequence? Yet no greater not that concerning the *Messias* which deserveth no answer, being so absurd, and bordering with blasphemie.

The second Reason, Why Scripture cannot be the rule of faith, is, because PROTESTANTS *believe many things whereof the Scripture maketh no mention at all, as the keeping holy the Sunday for the Sabbath, or Saturday, the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, the Trinity of Persons in God, that there is one person although two natures in Christ: for the Scripture maketh no more mention of Persons then of Papish-transubstantiation: that Baptism of Heretiks is not to be reiterat, against the* Donatists: *that Ordination of lawful Ministers should not be reiterat against* Marcion: *that Baptism and the Lords Supper are Sacraments, which are the very fundamentals of your Religion.* Pa. Rea. 2

I answer to this, that errour is broodie, for ere it be confessed by some men, they will broach absurd Tenets, and shake foundations which appeareth evidently here. For this man denyeth the Articles of our Creed to be groun- Pro. An. 1

 -ums

wonderful providences sealing this word; the testimonie of adversaries, *Jews* and *Gentils* to the doctrine therein contained, the testimonie of old and late writters to our whole Canon. And seeing the Lord hath sealed it, and it is called his *Testament*, none should adde to it, or alter any point contained therein. This is expresly forbidden *Deut.* 4. 2. 12. 32. *Pro.* 3. 6. how grosly *Papists* make void the *Testament* of the Lord by new *datives*, and in that are like the *Pharisees*, *Matth.* 15. 3. 6. shal appear hereafter.

4

Answer fourth, Although all books †are not reiected by us upon this account only because the *Iews* did so, but for many other good reasons; for, *self-murder* is commended in *Razis* there, contrar to the 6. Command, &c. The authours crave pardon for that which is spoken amiss, whereby it is acknowledged that they had not the spirit of infallibility; in all ages, exceptions were made against them as is well proved by our Divines, *S. Thomas* and *Nicodemus Gospels* have approbation of none, so need no refutation. Now I referre it to any Reader whither this first reason be sufficiently refuted, or if this reflecter understandeth Logick, or himself who thus reasoneth, The number of Scripture books is controverted

† *The Papists reject some of these Apocriphal books from the Canon of Scripture, as Esdras, the book of Baruch &c.*

controverted, therefore that which on all hands betwixt PROTESTANTS and *Papists*, is acknowledged to be Scripture is not the determiner of faith. Who will not perceive here a miſ-ſtated queſtion and groſs non-conſequence? Yet no greater not that concerning the *Meſſias* which deſerveth no anſwer, being ſo abſurd, and bordering with blaſphemie.

The ſecond Reaſon, Why Scripture cannot be the rule of faith, is, becauſe PROTESTANTS *believe many things whereof the Scripture maketh no mention at all, as the keeping holy the Sunday for the Sabbath, or Saturday, the proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Father and the Son, the Trinity of Perſons in God, that there is one perſon although two natures in Chriſt: for the Scripture maketh no more mention of Perſons then of Papiſh-tran ſubſtantiation: that Baptiſm of Heretickes is not to be reiterat, againſt the* Donatiſts: *that Ordination of lawful Miniſters ſhould not be reiterat againſt* Marcion: *that Baptiſm and the Lords Supper are Sacraments, which are the very fundamentals of your Religion.* Pa. Rea. 2

I anſwer to this, that errour is broodie, for ere it be confeſſed by ſome men, they will broach abſurd Tenets, and ſhake foundations which appeareth evidently here. For this man denyeth the Articles of our Creed to be groun- Pro. An. 1

 ded

ded on Scripture, which is most abominable to utter. What, is not the *Trinity*, the Sacrament of *Baptism* and the *Supper* scriptural truths? Let not this be heard in *Gath*. This †*Sess.* 7 giveth the Council of †*Trent* the lie, so the au- *Can.* 1. thor is anathematized by them. Let *Papists* *de Sacr.* read such as writ positive *Divinity*, these *in gen.* points are aboundantly proved by them from *Scripture*, Catechists will teach them to speak better, and if they be not founded there, why do your own writters prove them thence?

Secondly, The mysterie of the Trinity is di- *An.* 2. rectly in Scripture. 1. *Jo.* 5. 7. there are three which bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, these three are one. The Word Person is in Scripture, *Heb.* 1. 3. we indeed make use of words in the doctrine of the Trinity which are not Scripture words, but all the things are there, otherwise our foundations would soon dissolve. This is *Augustins* answer against the *Arrians*, *Contra Max. lib.* 3. *cap.* 5. and *Naz. Orat.* 5. *de Theol.* yea your own *Bellarmin lib.* 2. *de Christo. cap* 2. saith, *Quadam verba sunt utilia ad explicanda mysteria Scripturæ, quæ licet in Scripturis non habeantur, eorum tamen æquivalentia & semina ibi habentur.* i. e. Some words are necessar for explaining the mysteries of Scripture which though they be not contained in the Scriptures

yet their parallels and ſeeds are contained there. This he proveth by inſtances, chs. 3. 4. 5 which I need not to tranſlate. So that the Tenets which we maintaine concerning the *Trinity* and the two *Sacraments*, being *Scripture* truths, it is groſs to ſay, we have no *Scripture* warrand for theſe. & ſeeing we may make uſe of words for explaining divine truths any may behold the weakneſs of this Reply. The name *Trinity*, and *Sacrament* is not in Scripture; therefore the thing is not there. As for the *Sabbath*, we once prove from *Scripture* that *Saturday* is no *Sabbath* to us, *Col.* 2. 16. 17. then from *Scripture* that one day of *ſeven* behoved to be obſerved by reaſon of the fourth Command which is Moral. Secondly, That the ſeventh in number is Moral, & the ſeventh day in order, only ceremonial. Thirdly That the Lords-day by right ſucceedeth † as is here made out. And what day can be more fit then that on which Chriſt Jeſus aroſe, and put an end to the work of Redemption? Then our Lord came in amongſt the midſt of his Diſciples. *Jo.* 20. 26. which *Maldonat* on the place confeſſeth to be ſome proof to ſhew that the Lords-day hath its origen from the will of Chriſt. *Acts* 20. 7. The Diſciples conveened to the worſhip and the breaking of bread that day, and 1. *Cor.* 16 they had their collections that day: *Hierom contra Vigilantium*

† *See Palmer & Caudrey about the Sabbath*

tium sayeth, that *per unam Sabbati* is understood the Lords-day. And *Rev.* 1. 10. There is express mention of the Lords day, on which place *Ribera* the *Iesuit* remarketh that in the Apostles times, the solemnity of the *Sabbath* was changed to the Lords-day, and consecrated by the *Lords Resurrection*. *Estius* on *Gal.* 4. v. 10. refuteth you fully by saying, *Dici Dominica observationem Apostolicam esse constat ex Scriptura*. i. e. It is clear from Scripture that the Apostles observed the Lords day. How then can you say that we have no Scripture for it? Thirdly, That the holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father and the Son, is clear in Scripture, *Io.* 14. 16. 17. *Ioh.* 15. 26. *Io.* 16. 7. *Gal.* 4. 6. Fourthly, That there be two Natures in Christ, is clear, *Io.* 1. 14. *The Word was made flesh and dwelt among st us.* And *Augustin* who refuteth *Rebaptization* maintained by *Donatists*, maketh no use of *unwritten Traditions*, against that errour, but of that Scripture, *Eph.* 4. 5. *One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism*, for he sayeth, *recurramus ad fontem, viz. Scripturas*: *let us return to the Scriptures which are the fountain*; then citeth that text mentioned *Tom.* 7. *lib.* 5. *cap.* 26. and *Ordination* is expressed in that *Tense*, which by vertue of the word, excludeth *Reiteration*. It being a matter of Order if it be once done accord-

ing to the rule, 1. *Tim.* 4. 14. it is enough; neither should this be debated here, for all that we affert is, that all points neceſſar to ſalvation are comprehended in Scripture, either expreſly or conſequentially, by general or particular precepts, *Perinde ſunt ea quæ ex Scripturis colliguntur, atq; ea quæ ſcribuntur,* ſaith *Nazianzen,*† i. e. *Theſe things which by neceſſary conſequence are deduced from Scripture are of the ſame force with theſe which are written in it.* Let the Reader judge whither Popery be a ſafe way, which buildeth our main foundations upon humane teſtimonie, and derogats ſo much from the *Scriptures* of GOD. Yea, ere they will give them their due, rather will they ſtrengthen *Anti-Trinitarians, Arrians, Anti-Sacramentarians, Anti-Sabbatarians, Donatiſts* and *Separatiſts.* The Lord grant repentance to ſuch, who leaving the truth have amaſſed a body of errors.

† *Naz. de Theol orat.* 5.

Thirdly. For that amongſt many Verſions, *yea and* corruptions *of* Scripture, *which all do acknowledge, and each ſect imputeth to its adverſaries, it ſeemeth very hard to diſcern* authentick Scripture, *many of the originals being loſt, and the extract comming to the hands of very few, and few underſtand the Hebrew and Greek tongues wherein they are written, and yet, of this firſt of all we muſt be underſtood and aſſured, if we will not waver in matters of faith.* *Pa. Rea.* 3.

Anſwer

Pro. An. 1. *Answer first*, This is a digression to another question concerning the *Version*: for I would ask, if there be any right *Version* at all? this will not be denyed, for the old Latine translation is acknowledged by you, then it is the rule of faith and no humane testimony. What doth this arguing prove against the point? there be some corrupted *Versions*, Ergo, the *Original rightly translated* must not determine my faith; some men are evil cloathed, therefore a man should not be well cloathed against the cold; there is no consequence there. Further, this objection maketh the word of God useles to men. Now, is it like that all should be commanded to go to the *Law and Testimony*, to *search the Scriptures*, if they could not be had by any? Yea this *Objection* spoileth *Providence*, of its rent of praise which hath appeared so visibly in the preservation of the *Scriptures*. And we bless his Name for it that we have the *Originals* in *Hebrew* and *Greek*, and so pure a *translation*, that if any will compare them they wil find great faithfulnes and skill in the *translators*.

An. 2. But to answer this impertinent *Objection* more fully, we say that the Version is a Commentary be way of interpretation, and we make neither the translatiõ of the 70. nor of the vulgar Latine authentick; but whẽ we find errours in either, we go *ad judicem incorruptum*

tum hoc est primævam linguam : to the uncorrupted Judge that is the first language, so much speaketh your *Acosta. lib. 2. cap. 10.* and in this rightly. But yee Romanists have preferred the vulgar Latine to the Hebrew and Greek, whereas it is a corrupt translation, as some of your own testifie, and corrupteth the doctrine, witneis that one text for many, *Gen. 3. 15. Ipsa conteret caput tuum.* She shal break thy head, which is contrar to the Hebrew (hu). to the 70 αυτος. and purteth the Virgin Mary for Christ, so overturneth a foundation. *Pagnin. in his Preface to the Hebrew Grammar*, saith, *Optarem ut ostenderent mihi Germanam translationem, quæ enim passim legitur non est Hieronymi incorrupta translatio.* i. e. I wish they would shew me the Genuin translation, for that which is cōmonly received is not *Hieroms* pure translation, and *Sixtus Senensis Bib. lib. 8. sub finem*, sayeth, *Multa ibi sunt parum accommodate versa.* There are many things in it not fitly rendered: so that our Version will be found as good as any. And we are not hindered to run to the fountains in case of doubting, we make use of these streams as helps, and the Version is an humane instrument leading us to the well-head of the Original tongues. *Dei verbum non est lingua sed doctrina* : The word of GOD is not the language but the

doctrine

doctrine, faith, *River* in his *Isag. cap.* 1. and we need Grammar more then Tradition for understanding thereof.

Pa. Rea. 4 *Reason fourth. Many cannot read Scripture, and more as yet do not understand it, the Scripture then or written word cannot be the Rule of Faith to these poor ignorants, but their Churches or Pastors authority. And so it seemeth the Scripture cannot be the rule of faith to all persons, or in all points, or of any point contained in it self, untill I be first assured of some infallible rule, that this translation I rely upon is conform to the original in all points, and this Bible I am reading is the authentick word of God.*

Pro. An. 1. *Answer* First, This maketh nothing against our assertion, wherein it is only said that the Scripture is the rule of faith to a right discerner, which is granted by the Arguer in the next reason. It is *Regula regulativa* to all, apt and meet to decide all controversies, if men have ears to hear what the Spirit saith to the Churches: if it be not *Regula regulans* to some who are ignorant and unstable, *Vitium est in Organo*, the fault is in the Organ. It is ill argued to say the Sun shineth not, because blind men see it not.

An. 2. *Secondly.* They who cannot read the Scriptures can hear them read, and it is more easie for dark ignorant ones to hear the word

read

read and explained in their own language, then to travel from *Scotland* to *Rome* to hear the sentence of the Pope, for they could not understand the language in which it is delivered, they cannot travel through their decretals and acts. They know not if it be a lawful Pope, who pronounceth the sentence. And by their Confessours here they may be and are deceived.

Thirdly, It is the priviledge and promise of God *to open the heart, to enlighten the eyes*, by the word read and preached, but no where hath the word of man this prerogative. See *Is.* 32. 3. 4. and *Is.* 35. 5. 6. 7. 8. These are Gospel prophecies. The Roman Trash may well make seeing men blind, but will never make blind men see the right way. *An.* 3.

Fourthly, We do not deny ministeriall helps to unlettered people, for such are commanded, *Heb.* 13. 7. and 17. provided alwayes their faith be resolved into the word of God, at least *interpretative & virtualiter*. What ever means be used, this milk of the Word is the authentick instrument which begetteth faith, and it must be received not as the word of man, albeit the treasure be in earthen vessels, and the milk in a wooden pape. The difference of assent betwixt the learned and the unlearned is only accidental and modal, the one being more expres then *An.* 4.

the other; we Catechiſe and inſtruct the ignorant, and require them to hear the Church and follow their guides, ſo far as they follow Chriſt. 1. *Cor.* 11. 1. we hold forth *communia fidei motiva*, *interna πίστεως*, inward teſtimonies, the common motives of faith, reaſons and teſtimonies of old and late, and what ever may help their edification: but we dare not lead them from the Scripture to men, neither will the interpretation of the Scripture permit us to admit of an other determiner. And it may be wel enough known by them who underſtand theſe languages, that theſe Greek and Hebrew words do thus ſignifie as they are tranſlated, without the help of an infallible decree of Pope or Council thereanent. Without this alſo, GODS word can diſcover it ſelf to be from GOD as hath been ſhewed already.

Pa. Rea. 5. *Reaſon* 5. *Reading of the Scripture with the privat ſpirit, and taking it up as every one thinketh, maketh all the controverſies in Chriſtendom, daily multiplying both Hereſies and ſects.* Luther *no ſooner ſwerved from the Church, and denyed her authority, but as ſoon he broached this principle, That every man might take the Bible & follow that interpretation which after due diligence uſed, he thought beſt, whereupon preſẽtly did ſpring up an incredible number of different ſects,* Antimonians, Oſiandrians

Osiandrians, Majoristes, Synergists, &c. *Now hear what* Luther *himself said of* Calvins *heresie*, Tom. 7. fol. 380. *I scarce ever read, saith he, of a more deformed heresie, which presently in the beginning was divided into such variety of sects, as so many Toads, and such disagreement of opinions not one like to another. You see then how the word cannot be the determiner of faith, which all these sects take with you for their rule, yet alone will never agree them. As for that you say, the scripture hath Divine authority, Heavenly majestie, and maketh Spiritual impressions on the soul, all this I grant, if once a man know or believe it to be the word of GOD.*

Answer First, All this is answered to the fourth or fifth question, and should not be brought in here, yet passing the digression and informality, which I hope the Reader cannot impute to me the Defender. I answer to the 5. Reason, the Scriptures in the Primitive Church were published to all, this your own *Azorius* confesseth, *Instit. mor. p.* 1. *lib*: 8. *c.* 26. the Scriptures in the Primitive Church were to be published throughout all Nations, and therefore made common in the most famous languages. In *Hierom* and *Chrysostome's* dayes the ley people were exercised in reading the Scriptures. *Espencaus* saith, *Comment. on Tit.* 3. 2. it is manifest by the Apostles doctrine

Pro. An. 1.

doctrine, *Col.* 3. 16. and by the practise of the Church, that the publick use of reading the scriptures was then permitted to the people. The Council of *Nice* decreed saith *Agrippa*, that no Christian should be without a Bible. *Augustin* alloweth, *de Doct. Christi.* the use of scriptures to all, for he saith, they are not so hard, but every one by his use making of them may attain to so much knowledge of them as may further him in his salvation. *Chrysost. hom.* 3. *de Lazaro.* exhorts all men and women, yea Tradsmen to get Bibles. Now I pray you to what purpose if they dare not search for the sense of them?

Pro. An. 2. Secondly, It is denyed that when privat men search the Scriptures, this is an act of a privat spirit,† for such may pray, and have the spirit of grace and supplication poured forth on them, according to the promise, *Zach.* 12. 10. and none call that a privat spirit, so they may interpret *Scripture* by *Scripture*, and have the gift of it. Hear your own *Gerson prima part. de ex. doct. Si aliquis non authorizatus sit excellenter in sacra scriptura eruditus, plus credendum est ejus assertioni quam Papæ declarationi.* i. e. If any not ordained be well instructed in the holy Scriptures, his assertion is more to be believed then the Popes declaration. Secondly, Our Divines distinguish well three sorts of interpreters

† *It may be privat respecting one which is publick ratione modi & medii & è contra.*

preters, the first is extraordinar and miraculous. 1. *Cor.* 12. 30. The second is ordinar and ministerial. 1. *Cor.* 14. 32. The spirits of the Prophets are subject to the Prophets. The third is of privat persons who are commanded to try the spirits, and are commended for so doing. *Act.* 8. 28. 29. *Act.* 17. 11. The first kynd of interpretation is gone, the two next are in use as yet, but the one is subservient to the other. Thirdly, The different sects that lay claim to Scripture, cannot deprive us of the priviledge to search it and make use of it. Will any man approve this argument? Meat and drink is abused by some therefore none should eat or drink. If the matter be indifferent and subject to abuse, then we are to restrain our selves of liberty in the use of that indifferent thing. *Vitandum est licitū non necessariū propter vicinitatem illiciti. Aug. de civ. Dei lib.* 15. But when it is necessar *necessitate precepti & medij*, by necessity of precept and mean, who can forbid the use of a necessar mean? Now it is most necessar to improve the Scriptures by reading, understanding, application, meditation, and blessed is he who doth so day and night, sitting or standing. *Deut.* 6. 6. It is absurd to say (albeit *Luther* and *Calvin* did differ in some points) that he fathered the sects of *Germany* on *Calvin*, who was as free of

Munster

Munſter malady as the man unborn, and was *malleus hæreticorum* as his learned writtings teſtifie abundantly. In that place cited, he ſpeaketh of the ſwarms of ſects, which were indeed monſtrous like, at that time, but never imputed it to the uſe making of Scripture, for then he would not have underſtood himſelf, nor could he blame *Calvin* for it upon that account, ſeeing it was his own tener. Now Reader, ſtay and impartially conſider the weaknes and impertinency of theſe 5 reaſons, why our faith ſhould not be reſolved into the Scriptures and determined by them. For the ſume of all is thus concluded. The word of GOD is not wel underſtood by ſome, is evil tranſlated by others, and Hereticks and Schiſmaticks have abuſed it: therefore, we ſhould not make uſe of it as the rule of faith and manners. This is a Paralogiſm and confuſed rapſodie, but I paſs it; for ſons of Babel muſt daub with untempered mortar, and be Babel-like in their way.

§ 1. Although theſe 5. Reaſons be anſwered ſufficiently, yet for further ſatisfaction to the Reader, theſe two particulars ſhal be diſcuſſed. Queſtion 1. Whoſe it is to interpret Scripture. R. In the firſt place it belongeth to the *Miniſterial Church*, *Paſtors and Officers* called of GOD to that employment, are ordinarily better gifted for that work

work then other men: I say *ordinarily*, because in some cases it may be otherwise, and the Lord may raise up extraordinary interpreters, this appeareth from 1. *Cor.* 14.29. And the judgement of a pure Church in dubious cases, should weigh much with privat Christians. Secondly, Privat Christians may read the *Scriptures*, search for their sense, improve them privatly for edification, and examine what is said by others, for they have the promise to attain, *Jer.* 31. 34. a precept to improve, 1. *Pet.* 4. 10. and a priviledge to try *Acts* 17. 11. 1. *Cor.* 10. 15. this judgement of discretion no man can take from them, *Io.* 10. 4. *Matth.* 7. 15. more then the taste from a man. Is not that spirit which dyted the scripure the best interpreter of it? But privat men may have that, 1. *Cor.* 2. 15. This their judgement is not authoritative nor judicial, yet bindeth themselves, and he is a better Christian who followeth, then he who stiffleth it, so speak all Casuists. *Chrysost. hom.* 13. *in act. Apost.* reproveth such as professed they would be Christians, yet doubted to whom they should adhere; have ye not judgement sayeth he, and have ye not scriptures? *Aug. Confes. lib.* 13. *sub finem cap.* 22. *& cap.* 23. explaining that place, 1. *Cor.* 2. 15. sayeth *Quisque fidelis est spiritualis*, every beleever is spiri-

tual

tual and hath a judgment of discretion. *Picus Mirandula Theor.* 16. sayeth, *If the greatest part of a Councill conclude against the word of God, Simplicius, if a rurall man have the Gospel for him, he is most to be beleeved and adhered to.* This sheweth that the scripture should be read and searched by such, and privat men having this priviledge, should make use of it in a Gospel way, for edification, not for destruction.

§. 2. *Question second*, How shall Scripture be interpreted? *Answer first*, Not by the Pope, for people are commanded to search the Scriptures, before there was a Pope in the world. *Iohn* 5. 39. therefore, that cannot be a necessar mean. *Secondly*, Not can all make use of Generall Councills, seeing these are more hard to be understood then the Scripture. *Thirdly*, Not by carnall reason. For the naturall man perceiveth not the things of God. 1. *Cor.* 2. 14. But *first* by Prayer and Meditation, for the Lord giveth the Spirit to them that ask him, *Luke* 11. 13. and this mean is practised by experienced beleevers. *Psal.* 119. 18. *Secondly*, By a docile cleanly frame of heart. *Psal.* 25: 9. 10. *Matth.* 5. 8. Thirdly, By comparing Scripture with scripture, obscure places with these which are clear,; *ex Gr.* who can interpret *Psal.* 8. v. 2. so well as the Evangelist, *Matth.* 21. 16.

or the 4. and 5. verſes, ſo as the Apoſtle to the *Heb.* 2. 7. 8. or theſe words *Matth.* 26. 28 ſo as the Evangeliſt *Luke* 22. 20. with *Mat.* 26. 29. where after the conſecration of the Cup it is called the fruit of the vine. Or that text, *Matth.* 19. 23. *A rich man ſhal hardly enter into the kingdom of Heaven.* ſo as the interpretation of the Evangeliſt, *Mark. cap.* 10. 34. *How hard it is for them that truſt in riches to enter into the kingdom of God.* Fourthly, By the Commentars of ancient and late writters, by the preaching of thoſe who are called of God to that work: with this caution that we try the ſpirits, whither they be of God or not. 1. *Io.* 4. 1. Fifthly, For the exact interpretation of places, which ſhould be propounded to others for edification, the knowledge of the Original tongues, *Hiſtory, Chronology, Topography,* is in meaſure requiſit. This is the way by which the ancient Fathers expounded Scripture. *Chryſoſt. in Gen. hom.* 13. αἱ ἅγιαι γραφαὶ *Sacra Scriptura cum nos tale quid docere vult, ſeipſam exponit, & auditorem errare non ſinit.* i. e. The holy Scripture when it will have us to teach any ſuch thing it expounds it ſelf, and ſuffereth not the hearer to erre. Yea a Jeſuit *Acoſta, lib.* 3. *de Chriſto revelato. ch.* 25. confeſſeth ſo much, being overcome with the truth. *Nihil perinde ſcripturam mihi aperire*

 videtur

videtur, atque ipsa scriptura, itaque diligens attenta frequensque lectio, meditatio, oratio, & collatio scripturarum, summa regula ad intelligendam scripturam mihi semper visa est. i. e. Nothing seemeth to me more useful, for opening up scripture, then scripture it self: therefore the diligent, attentive, and frequent reading of the Scriptures, meditation, prayer, and comparing of them together, hath ever seemed to me the best rule for understanding scripture. *Aug. de doct. Christi lib. 2. cap. 9. In his enim quæ aperte in scriptura proposita sunt, inveniuntur illa omnia, quæ continent fidem, spem, charitatem, moresque vivendi: de quibus libro superiore tractavimus tum vero facta quadam familiaritate, cum ipsa lingua divinarum scripturarum, in ea quæ obscura sunt aperienda & discutienda, pergendum est: ut ad obscuriores locutiones illustrandas, de manifestioribus sumantur exempla: & quadam certarum sententiarum testimonia, dubitationem de incertis auferant.*

Fa. Qu. 2. *Question second, How can the Scripture be judge seeing it is the rule?*

Pro. An. *Answer first,* It is a speaking rule, the Spirit of God speaketh there. The Acts of Parliament are both the law and judge of a case, albeit men pronounce the sense of them. So the Church hath the herauldry of this, and hence may pronounce the sentence: but the determination

determination is from the word alone, for humane teſtimonie can adde no weight to the Divine.

To this it is returned, that the ſecond anſwer is no better then the firſt. The Scripture ſay you is a ſpeaking rule, and may be both rule and judge. But the Acts of Parliament and civil laws be as well ſpeaking laws, in matters of temporal government, as the ſcripture is in ſpiritual: and yet parties ſhould never agree, if the Lords of Counſel and Seſſion did not expound them, and pronounce ſentence from them, not as heraulds, but as judges: albeit they be tyed to conform their ſentence both to Acts of Parliament cuſtoms, and laws. Even ſo, ſcripture is indeed our law book, but the Church is our judge, for this our experience may prove, that there hath been no agreement amongſt them, who make any other judge then the Church, as all Sectaries commonly do. Beſide, it would ſeem to me againſt our oath of ſupremacie, not to acknowledge any other judge in matters of controverſie then ſcripture. Seing there his Majeſtie is ſaid to be, and we ſworn to acknowledge him, ſupream judge in all caſes, as well Civil as Eccleſiaſtick, and I pray God that Preachers and Miniſters, to whom only you aſcribe the power of heraldry, had not taken on the coat of arms, theſe years bygon, to publiſh any other ſentence, then that Pa. Rea.

which did proceed from the mouth of that ſupream judge.

Pro. An. *Anſwer firſt*, The Scripture we call a rule, becauſe it maketh the man of GOD perfect,

Duply. 2. *Tim.* 3. 16. as a rule doth a line, and the

1. doctrine therein is termed a judge, *Metonymically*, (properly a judge is a perſon) becauſe it is the voice of a ſupreame judge, who is our law-giver. This we ſpeak with the Scripture, *Io.* 12. 48. *Io.* 7. 51. and *Heb.* 4. 13. *It is the diſcerner of the thoughts of the heart.* Where κρινε is given to it. You grant here, *that it is our law book*, *Ergo*, *Metonymically* our judge and determiner it muſt be, for we appeal to the law for judgement. To this the Apoſtle *Paul* appealeth, *Act.* 26. 22. Then there be many caſes incident to a Chriſtian in his ſpiritual exerciſe, which none on earth can judge. The ſpiritual one is judged of no man, 1. *Cor.* 2. 15. yet this will diſcern the thoughts of his heart. The divine doctrine now written is the only impartial infallible determiner, *he who heareth not Moſes, the Prophets and the Apoſtles, will not hear one riſen from the dead.* Conſcience is a *rule*, *Rom.* 2. 14. a *witneſs*, *Rom.* 2. 15. and a *judge*, 1. *Io.* 3. 20. 21. It is to be conſidered, that there is a difference betwixt humane Courts and this work: the one concerneth temporals wherein we may be ruled by reaſon

reason, but here in matters of salvation we must have an infallible rule by revelation; albeit in humane Courts the rule the witness and the judge are different, for guarding against corruption to which fallen man is subject: yet in *foro divino*, in the court of GOD one may be witness, judge, rule, accuser, such is the scripture. The Spirit of GOD speaketh there. Is it not the law, the testimony the canon or rule? *Gal.* 6. 16. is it not a witnesser a warner? *Psal.* 19. 11. doth it not speak to men? *Rom.* 9. 17. and will it not judge us hereafter? *The word which I speak to you will judge you in the last day. Io.* 12. 48. if then, why now is it not our judge? Further, the judgement of discretion, is but a discretive faculty, no proper bench, and liker a watch then a judge, for it hath no authority over others, the Ministerial authority is subordinat, and more like the office of a steward nor of a proper judge. 2. *Cor.* 1. 24. Only the written word is the determiner, and the Lord speaking there, is absolute supreame judge, from whom there is no appealing.

Answer second, If the second be as good as the first it is well, for notwithstanding of all your weapon-shews, you yeeld in the end what I said, *that we should go to the law and testimony with all our cases, and that the scripture to any believer and right discerner hath divine* *Pro. An.* 2.

divine authority, Heavenly majestie, and maketh spiritual impressions on the soul. if it have divine authority is it not judge: Was there any more asserted in the first answer: we hold the same similitude; the King is head of Council and Session, the law ratified by King and Parliament is the rule, and the officers of Council and Session are administrators, So our Lord Jesus is the head of his Church, the written Word is the law, and the Ministers of the Gospel are administrators, by whom the people are directed and instructed. But if the officers go contrat to the will of the King and his law, the subjects may appeal from their administration to the acts of Parliament, and hear the Kings pleasure, when subjects wrong their inferiours and neighbours. See *Ps.* 85. 8. Hear what the Lord will say, and who hath ears to hear, let him hear what the Spirit sayeth to the Churches.

Pro. An. 3. *Answer third*, Ministers of the Gospel are called Messengers, *Rev.* 2. 2. *Cor.* 8. 23. So were they termed under the law, *Mal.* 2. 7. and doth not the Greek word κηρυξ oft used for Preacher in the N. T. signify a cryer or herauld: Why then do you scoff at Scripture: As for your prayer, it seemeth you pray all by the book, and here you are beside it: present or future things are the object of prayer, but that *factum* should be *infectum*,

to

to pray that a thing done ſhould be undone, is an unwarrantable petition; what hath been wrong in us heretofore ſhould be regrated, what is or hath been right, is the object of praiſe, but your prayer is unwarrantable and impoſſible.

Anſwer fourth, Albeit our Soveraign Lord the Kings Majeſtie be ſupream magiſtrat, according to the Scripture, 1. *Pet.* 2. 13. and *ex officio a nurſing father* to the Church, *Iſ.* 49. 23. to whom every man civil or Eccleſiaſtick doth owe ſubjection, *Rom.* 13. 1. Yet it will not follow, that the word of GOD is not the ſupream determiner of all controverſies in Religion. Whatſoever primitive Fathers gave to *Conſtantine* the great, *Theodoſius* elder and younger, &c. that we give to our Soveraign Lord the King: And there be no Church on earth, which by their confeſſions of faith honour the Magiſtrat more then we. Yet notwithſtanding of this prerogative aſſerted, and maintained againſt Papiſts by our † Divines. Our Soveraigne Lord the Kings Majeſtie will not deny, that the ſcripture is the determiner of all the Articles of our faith: ſeeing he maintaineth the 39. Articles of the Church of *England*, whereof this is one. *Pro. An.* 4.

† *Viz.* *Bp. Bilſon de Subject.* *Uſher.* *Dr. Strang.*

Anſwer fifth, How cometh it to paſs that you own the oath of ſupremacie? (By calling *Pro. An.* 5.

calling it ours) seeing the main scop of that oath was, to renounce the Pope his jurisdiction in the Kings dominions, you must either have a dispensation for this, that you here subscribe a renunciation of the Popes supremacie, or else you will be declared apostat at Rome. And no Papist keeping his principles, can averre that which is here set down under your hand.

Pa. Qu. 3. Question third, *If the Scripture be judge, why be there so many controversies undecyded?*

Pro. An. *Answer*, The perverseness of men is to blame for this. Unstable, unlearned ones wrest the Scripture to their own perdition, 2. *Pet.* 3. 16. and make difficulties where there be none. As much as containeth the way to salvation is plain in Scripture, so that he who runneth may read and learn.

Pap. Reply. Reply, *In your third answer you please me well, and it confirmeth all I have said, but refuteth your former answer to the full. For if the unlearned as well as the unstable wrest the scripture to their own destruction, then Scripture can neither be the determiner of faith nor the judge of controversies to them, and so they must have another, both to instruct the ignorant and settle the unstable; as we must all have some infallible judge to know who wrest the Scripture who not: otherwise we may well agree in the letter, but we will never*

agree

agree in the ſenſe and meaning thereof. But as much (*ſay you*) as containeth the way to ſalvation is plain, ſo that he may runne who readeth it. *Sir, doth it not belong to ſalvation that there be three perſons in God, one in Chriſt, that Baptiſm is a Sacrament, &c. Now, where find you this in Scripture either running or ſiting? Or if Scripture be ſo plaine & clear as ye make it, why be there ſo many Comments on it among your own men and ſo different? Why is there amongſt* Proteſtants 200. *expoſitions upon theſe four words,* This is my Body? *As* Cuſanus *in his holy court obſerveth.*

Anſwer firſt, I am glade that the written word of GOD pleaſeth you ſo, who have all this time ſpent words to throw all power out of its hand, and hang it at the Popes foot. But you ſay, *it refuteth what was ſaid formerly.* This cannot be made good, for ſtill I ſaid it was the rule of faith, to right diſcerners, and ſometime you grant this, as in the latter part of your *fifth Reaſon*, whereby indeed you refute all you have ſaid, and yeelds the cauſe fully. Now what contradiction can be here? *The ſcripture is the rule to all right diſcerners, and as many as walk according to this rule peace ſhal be on them: but men who wreſt the word, unlearned, unſtable ſoules, fall into perdition for abuſe of the word, and deſtroy themſelves; hence proceedeth many controver-* *Pro. An. 1.*

ſies. Is it not a ſtrange conſequence to inferre thence, that theſe unlearned, unſtable ſoules ſhould have another rule and another judge? In the 19. of *Luke* v. 27. it is ſaid by our Lord, that his enemies who would not have him to reign over them, ſhould be brought forth and ſlain before him: will it therefore follow, that he ſhould not reign over them? Or that they Jute ſhould have another King? The caſe is juſt alike here. It is granted that many have their conſciences ſeated, 1. *Tim.* 4. 2. are ſeared 2. *Tim.* 3. 8. ſelf-condemned. *Tit.* 3. 11. under ſtronge deluſions. 2. *Theſſ.* 2. 11. Is the Scripture to blame for this? You have many faults to that which you like not. Hear *Optatus Milevitanus adverſus Paliner Donatiſtam. Vos dicitis licet, nos non licet, inter licet veſtrum, & non licet noſtrum, nutant animi populorum. If you ſeek a judge* (ſaith he) *a Pagan cannot do it nor a Jew, they are enmies: Chriſtians by their diſcerning faculty cannot, they being impeded ſtudio partium Then upon earth there can be no judge: ſhal we go to Heaven for one? Quorſum, cum hic habemus in Evangelio teſtamentum.* i. e. *To what purpoſe, ſeeing we have the Teſtament here in the Goſpel. If there be a contention among brethren, (ſaith he) quaritur Teſtamentum, the Teſtament is ſought. So we muſt*

decide

decide our controverſies by the Old and New Teſtament, etenim præſentia quæ modo facitis futura conſpexerat Chriſtus. i. e. *For Chriſt did foreſee theſe things as future, which ye make to be now preſent, and hath he foreſeen it, and will he not provide a remedie for it?*

Secondly, Theſe unlearned unſtable ones, who are to be deſtroyed, will not hear, underſtand nor obey his word: then is it like that they will underſtand the voluminous decrees of the Pope? May they not wreſt his ſentence and ſenſe more eaſily then Scripture words? Or dare any ſay, that humane ordinances will ſooner compeſce, command, or regulat them, then the word of GOD? *Pro. An.* 2.

Thirdly, We do not deny Miniſterial helps for inſtructing and ſetling the ignorant and unſtable, nor judicial ſentences ſubaltern and ſubordinat to the law. But that there is an infallible man on earth to whoſe ſentence I muſt unplicitly ſubmit, it is ridiculous to averre it, and the broaching of that errour hath occaſioned more controverſies, then were formerly in the Church, ſo far is it from compoſing differences. If ye were more in catechiſing the unlearned, and leis in regal commands, the law of GOD would be both better underſtood and obeyed. *Pro. An.* 3.

Fourthly, Albeit ſome places be hard to be underſtood by the unlearned, 2. *Pet.* 3. 16. *Pro. An.* 4.

other places are not so difficult. In the scripture an Elephant may swime, and a Lamb may wade. And the same particulars you again object are clearly holden forth in scripture as is formerly proved, in the vindication of my answer to your 1. Qu. in answer to Rea. 2. Yea the way to salvation is fair and patent there, and if we perish, our destruction is of our selves, seeing that book is not sealed to us. Commentaries, Church-canons, Ecclesiastick sentences, are helps and means for edification: but scripture is the authentick instrument, and all the authority is originally from it. And different expositions, according to the analogy of faith, may be, and will be, so long as there be diversity of gifts. But I ask why ye make use of Commentars, Seeing ye resolve all into the sentence of the Pope? And why do your Commentators differ so amongst themselves? If this hinder not your Ecclesiastick supremacie, why should it be brought to weaken scripture authority? It is hard to find where you are, for sometimes ye would have a judge to authorize scripture to you, sometimes you would have only one for the sense of scripture, then at last, you are for one only to the unlearned and unstable, such is your instability in this matter, that I wish the word of God may determine you aright in the point.

Question

Queſtion fourth, *Were it not better to eſtabliſh a man or an aſſembly of men judge of Controverſies, ſeeing the Church is the* pillar of truth, 1. *Tim* 3. 15. *and hath the promiſe of preſence* Matth. 28. 20. *then that every Sect ſhould be laying claim to the Scriptures and yet taking ſundry wayes.* Pa. Qu. 4.

Anſwer, The promulgation of the law is not denyed to the pure Goſpel Church, truth is maintained and preſerved there, as the law was keeped in the Ark, thus it is called the *pillar* of it. But the Church of Rome is not ſuch being a very ſtrumpet, *and making the Kings of the earth drunk with the cup of her fornications. Rev.* 17. 2. *that promiſe of preſence* is made to the univerſal Church, but no particular Church ſuch as Rome, can claim the meaſure or duration of it; who of theſe can ſay that they ſhal laſt to the end of the world? Albeit Sects lay claim to Scripture, yet their abuſe cannot take away our lawful uſe of it. Pro. An.

To this a Papiſt replyeth, That the queſtion is not directly anſwered by me, whither on man or many ſhould be judge of controverſies? To this he ſaith I dare not anſwer, becauſe I will not grant the power either to the high Biſhop or general council, nevertheleſs, he findeth this to have been the conſtant practiſe of the Church, both in the Old and New Teſtament eſtabliſhed by the expreſs word of God, and received by Pap. Reply.

by the Fathers in all ages: for in the Old Testament, from Deut. 17. *from* 8. *to* 13. *we read that GOD did command the people in matters of controversie to go to the Priests, Levits, and judge, who should be in those days appointed by him for that end, saying,* and thou shalt do according to the sense of the law which they shal teach thee, and according to the judgement which they shal tell thee. *Remark, he saith not according to the sense of the law which thou shalt read, but which they shal teach thee, not taken according to the privat judgement and spirit, but according to the judgmẽt which they shal tel thee, where God promiseth out of their mouth* judicii veritatẽ *truth and verity in judgement, or as you turn it,* sentence of judgement. *See for this also* 2. Chr. 19. 8. *where* Jehosophat *established what was first instituted. Viz. a council of Levits, Priests, and chief fathers of Israel, to judge not only between brethren and brethren, blood and blood, but also betwixt law and cõmandments, statutes and judgements. Not leaving law and commandments to the peoples privat reading, and interpretation, as you do in your rule of faith. In the* 11. *verse, he concludeth thus,* Amaziah is over you in all matters of the Lord; *where it is evident that the council and chief Priest is established judge of controversie, and not the written Word, as every*

one

one readeth and expoundeth. In the New Teſtament again you have this practiſe clearly ſet down, Acts. 15. *Where* Paul *and* Barnabas *though Apoſtles themſelves, go up to Jeruſalem about the queſtion of circumciſing the Gentiles converted to the faith. And there was holden the firſt council in which this is decided, not out of Scripture, but by the authority of the Council it ſelf.* It ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt and us, *ſaid they, having the aſſured promiſe of the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, as the Church hath at all time. Wherefore after the Apoſtles, councils have decided with the ſame authority, and upon the ſame infallible ground of the Holy Ghoſts aſſiſtance promiſed to the Church. Many controverſies are acknowledged by* Proteſtants *for points of faith, without expreſs paſſage of Scripture.* Marcion *teaching that Baptiſm ſhould be conferred more then once; and* Donatiſts *that Baptiſm conferred by* Hereticks *ſhould be reiterated, as invalid, are condemned, in the council holden at* Rome *under* Melchiades *Pope in the year* 313. *now what paſſage of Scripture I pray you is for this?* Sabellius *putting one perſon only in the God-head, is condemned in the council of* Alexandria *under* Pope Cornelius *in the year* 319. *but ſcripture maketh no mention of perſons,* Neſtorius *putting two perſons in* Chriſt *is condemned in the Generall*

Councill

Council holden at Epheſus *under* Pope Cæleſtin *the year* 434. *Yet neither doth the Scripture ſpeak of this. The* Monothelits *giving to Chriſt one will in two Natures, are condemned in the third general Council holden at* Conſtantinople *under* Pope Agathon *the year* 679. *albeit there be no formal ſcripture for this. So you ſee it belongeth both in the Old and New Teſtament, to the high Prieſt and general Council to decide controverſie, either by Scripture if there be any paſſage clear for that point, or without Scripture, by Apoſtolick tradition conſerved in the Church which ſcripture it ſelf warranteth.* 2. Theſſ. 2. 15. Hold faſt the traditions which ye have learned either by word or our epiſtle; *but it ſeemeth you care not who be condemned, or by whom, if you take away all power on earth to condemne your ſelves. Every* Proteſtant *will be condemned by none but Scripture, and yet will make none judge of the Canon, Verſion, and ſenſe of Scripture but himſelf. All your anſwer is, that we grant the Promulgation of the law to the pure Goſpel Church, but you ſhew not what is this pure Goſpel Church, neither can you infallibly prove the purity of the Goſpel it ſelf, or that there is a Goſpel, or the true ſenſe of the Goſpel but by the Catholick Church her authority. Hear* Aug. contra Ep. fund. cap. 5. *Where he ſaith, I my ſelf would not have believed*

lieved the Gospel, were it not that the authority of the Church moved me to it. Now the Catholick Church is, that whose faith is spread through all the world in the Apostle Paul *his time, which maketh her to be justlie called the Catholick Roman Church: and whose faith hath been in all ages since Christ, which all the records of the* Protestant *writters witneſs of the Roman Church; wherein the succession of Popes, Bishops, Councils, is made conspicuous to all who have written Chronology or Church history in every age, none whereof make mention of your Church, or of men professing your tenets before* Luther *and* Calvin, *from whom ye dissent in many things.*

Answer first, This is a prolix reply, the substance of which might have been taken up in seven or eight lines. As it is spacious, so it is an impertinent rapsodie, and like a beggers cloak clouted here and there with divers parcells without any method or cohesion; It seemeth to have been taken out of some *Index*, and cast in here to fill the page. For the answer was, *That the promulgation of the law is not denyed to the pure Gospell-Church, which is not the Roman-Church, for it is impure.* Is not this a direct answer? You prove, that there hath been a Ministerial-Church in the old and new Testament, which we doe not deny; but this is the point, did they so *Pro. Dn.* 1.

pronounce ſentence, and decide Controverſies, that all diſcretive judgement was taken from people? or called they themſelves infallible, whether they had ſcripture warrand or not? Or, wil the promiſe of preſence, to the Apoſtles, Prophets and penners of Scripture, in meaſure and duration agree to any Church Officers now on Earth? Or, ſhould promiſes made to the Univerſal-Church agree to any particular Church ſuch as Rome? Or will promiſes made to the collective body of the Church agree to the repreſentative? unleſs theſe be proved you fight with your own ſhadow. For we are much for the authority of Chriſts Church, and think that her judgment of old, and late, ſhould ſway privat men, unleſs they can prove by ſcripture, or ſound reaſon, that ſhe erreth. We are much for the authority of all lawful Councils, and we give them all reverence in regard of the authority of their conſtitution, but if they depart from the ſcriptures we owe them not active obedience. Well ſpeaketh our learned *Camero, tom. 1. tract. de infallibilitate eccleſiæ, So oft as any thing is decreed by a Council, or aſſembly of men, appointed by lawfull authority in the Church, it ſhould have this weight with us, that raſhly, without grave and diligent enquiry after the truth, it ſhould not be rejected by us.* And whereas it is alleadged,

there

there will be no effectual way against Controversies and divisions in religion, unlesse some one supream and infallible judge be appointed on Earth, in whose iudgement and decision, parties controverting should rest and acquiesce. It may be well answered in your own *Bellarmin* his wordes, *lib. 2. de Concil. cap. 19. It is no wonder if the Church remaine without any humane remedy, seeing the welfare of it doth not primarily rely upon humane industrie, but upon divine protection; seeing its King is GOD: therefore may and ought the Church to pray unto God, and it is certaine, he will care for the well-fare of it.*

Answer second, Albeit I cannot comprehend the purpose of this laxe discourse, yet for satisfaction to the Reader, I shal inform him in these 5. particulars. First, what Papists mean by the Church, or whither they understand themselves in this? Secondly, Whither Church officers since the dayes of the Apostles are infallible? Thirdly, What kind of obedience should be tendered to them? Fourthly, What government the Christian Church should have, whither Papal and Monarchical, or Aristocratical and Ministerial? Fifthly, How that testimony of *Augustin, non credidissem Scripturæ &c.* is to be understood. For the first, by the *Church*, all the *Jesuits*, who are the Popes life-guard, under- *Pro. Duply. 2.*

ſtand the *Pope*. So *Valentia diſp. Theol. tom. 1. diſp. 1. qu. 1. Coſter Enchir de ſum: Pont: Gretſer. Colloq. Ratiſ. Seſ. 1. Bell.* hanketeth in the point, for once he ſaith, *that the Pope without the Council may determine matters of faith, De Chriſto. lib. 2. cap. 28.* and *de Concil. lib. 2. cap. 17.* Againſt this *de verbo Dei lib. 3. cap. 3.* he ſaith, *the Pope with a Council is the judge of the true ſenſe of Scripture.* So ſpeaketh this reflecter. The *Sorboniſts, Janſeniſts*, and others of the Popiſh partie underſtand by the Church, the preſent Romiſh officers aſſiſted by the Pope, and ſtand by the Canons of the Councils of *Conſtance Seſſ. 4. 5.* and *Baſil. Seſſ. 2.* wherein it was decreed that the Pope ſhould obey the Council. The Council of *Trent* according to its manner is ambiguous herein *Seſſ. 4. decr. 2.* And ſaith, that the Church ſhould judge the true ſenſe of Scripture, yet tell us not what they mean by the Church. Now, whatever way it be taken, whither for Pope or Council, there muſt be another judge of controverſies, otherwiſe the Church wanted a judge 300 years, for there was no ſuch judge then pretending to the infallible ſupremacie now claimed. Secondly, The Romiſh Synagogue headed by the Pope cannot be our judge, for they are party partial againſt whom we have juſt acception. Thirdly, Is not this a jugling trick,

trick, that when controversies occasioned and raised by them, are in the Christian Church, they will have none to be judge but themselves: so they would be sure of the sentence, and must suspect their own cause. Fourthly, If by the Church they mean the Pope, as now they maintain, it is hard to call him judge of controversies, seeing it is a great controversie whither there should be any Pope at all, and beyond controversie with us that he is an usurper. Fifthly, According to the Popish tenet, the intention of the Priest is necessar in his ordination, in his Baptism; succession without interruption is necessar; and Simony maketh him no Pope, as *Gratian* telleth from the Canon law, *causa* 2. *qu.* 1. Now if so, he may be a Pagan, for who knoweth the Priests intention who baptized him? He may be a Laick, and yet without ordination upon the same ground; if one be such, it marreth uninterrupted succession, and so ceaseth the Pope. Then by your own writers it is clear, that many Popes entered by Simony, as *Barronius* testifieth, *Annal: tom.* 9. *ad annum. Christi.* 912. And *Alexander the* 6. was notorious that way. This un-Popeth all, for it breaketh the chain of succession, and leaveth the Church collective without any judge. It is clear hence, how slipperie the Romish Church is in its foundations: seeing

he

he whom they call the Church may be a Pagan
Secondly, As to the second thing proposed, viz. Whither Church officers since the days of the Apostles are infallible? The Church whither taken for Pope or Council, or Pope & Council is not infallible. When the Councils condemned hereticks of old, they did it not *pro arbitratu & imperio*: but judged by the Scriptures which is indeed an infallible rule, but the church taken whither for Pope or Council, or Pope and Council is not infallible. First, If the Jewish-church erred in matter of faith and worship, then may the christian-church erre also. For they had statutes, judgements, and promises: to them were committed the oracles of GOD. *Rom.* 3. 2. But *Aaron* and the people erred grosly, *Ex* 32. So did *Uriah* the Priest, 2. *Kings* 16. May not then Popes erre? Seeing *Aaron* the saint of the Lord was not infallible. Yea, both Priest and Prophet erred in judgement, see *Is.* 28. 7. on which words *Sanctius* the Jesuit saith, *Priests, Prophets, and people were spiritually drunk*. Did not the Church rulers while the Levitical Priest-hood lasted, procure the death of Christ? Secondly, Under the Gospel Popes and Councils have erred, *Ergo*, they are not infallible. *Tertullian* telleth *contra Praxeam*, that *Eleutherius* the Pope approved *Montanus* heresie, and obtruded

ded it on the Church as his *Irenicum*. Your own *Barronius* telleth *ad ann.* 302. that *Marcellus* the Pope sacrificed to Idols, *Athanasius* † testifieth, that *Liberius* the Pope was *Arrian*. *Honorius* was condemned in the sixth *General Council* as a *Monothelit*, *Anastasius* the Pope saith *Alphonsus*, *de cast. lib.* 5. *cap.* 25. was *Nestorian*. Now can *Monothelism*, *Nestorianism*, *Arrianism*, *Montanism* and Idolatry, be inherent to a man infallible? Or can a chair make that man who is *Arrian* Orthodoxe, or him who sacrificeth to Idols unerring, who will believe this?

† *Athanasius in epist. ad Solitariam vitam agentes.*

Councils may erre adversaries being judges, *Occam* asserteth so much, and *Petrus Alliaco Cardinalis qu. vesper. art.* 3. for he saith, that this promise, *the gates of hell shal not prevail against the Church*, is made *universo catui fidelium*, to the whole number of the faithful, not to the *representative Church* which may erre. *Panor: sup.* 1. *part. lib. decret. Dicit Ecclesiam qua non potest errare esse totam collectionem fidelium, nam ista est Ecclesia qua non potest errare*, that is, the whole company of believers which cannot erre. *Nic. de Clemang. in his disp. with the Parisians, saith, the promise Matth.* 18. *as likewise that Iohn* 16. *The spirit of truth shal lead you into all truth, belongeth only to spiritual*

ones

inet, and it were better to be much in fasting and prayer for direction, then to bragge we cannot erre. So then I reason, the Pope may erre, Councils may erre, *Ergo*, the Pope and Council may erre. The argument will hold here, *a divisis ad conjugata*. as well as thus, the Magistrat may be diseased, and his council infected; therefore both Magistrat and Council are subject to sickness. It is a deluding evasion, to say, that the Councils confirmed by the Pope cannot erre, for the Jesuits place the infallibility in the Pope, the *Parisians* in the Council, and they are not agreed in this amongst themselves: In the sense of the one, a Church Session confirmed by the Pope is as infallible as a Council. And in the sense of the other, a Council confirmed by a privat Bishop is as infallible as if it were confirmed by the Pope: Thus then we argue, that must have no entity which can find no subject, but Papists cannot agree upon the subject of this infallibility, therefore it is not *ens*. Further, General Councils have been of this judgement, that the Popes consent is not requisit for making their decrees right. For in the *Council of Chalcedon* where were conveened 630. fathers in the year 454. where *Martianus* the Emperour was present, it was contrar to the desire of the Popes Legats, appointed, that seeing the seat of *Rome* had

had no divine warrand for its ſupremacie, *Conſtantinople* ſhould have alike priviledges with it. This was as full a Councel as we read of, and yet all theſe fathers thought the Popes cõſent not neceſſary for their ſtatutes: Yea they declared his ſupremacie not to be *Juris Apoſtolici* in the firſt Councel of *Conſtantinople* which was the ſecond generall Councel. The Councills of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, judged the Councel to be above the Pope. In the firſt three generall Councills the Pope did not ſo much as preſide in them, either by himſelf or by his legats. For in the firſt, preſided *Hoſius Biſhop of Corduba*. In the ſecond *Nectarius*, *Biſhop of Conſtantinople*. And in the third at *Epheſus*, *Cyril Biſhop of Alexandria*, in which Councills, Controverſies were determined by the plurality of ſuffrages, and every one of the fathers there, did ſubſcrive their name to the conſtitutions and concluſions of the Councel. The councel of *Trent* again did all *Proponentibus legatis*, therefore, either it or they were in an errour, ſo not infallible. And indeed it is above diſpute that the councel of *Trent* was erroneous, and not the councel of *Chalcedon*, in that, which *Gregory the Great* and all ancients ſo extoll and commend.

This is ſaid not in the leaſt to derogate from lawfull councills which we judge ne-

ceſſat helps, for ordering the effaires of the houſe of God in diverſe exigencies. Yea, we give more to the foure *Generall Councills* then Papiſts doe, for they caſt both at the ſecond and fourth. But we have another judge and determiner, the Scripture of God. *Auguſtin* confirmeth this, *Nec ego nicænum, nec tu debes Ariminenſe, tanquã præjudicaturus præferre conſilium; nec ego hujus auctoritate, nec tu illius detineris. Scripturarum auctoritatibus, non quorumcunque propriis, ſed utriſque communibus teſtibus, res cum re cauſa cum cauſa, ratio cum ratione conſentiat.* i. e. Neither would I preferre the *Nicen*, nor ought you as prejudged to preferre the *Arimin* councel, I am not holden by this, or thou by that, but by the authority of the Scriptures which are witneſſes common to all, appropriat to none, let one thing agree with another, cauſe with cauſe, reaſon with reaſon.

† *Aug. contra Maxi. Arrian. Epiſcop.*

Thirdly, As to the third thing propoſed, The Church is not appointed to be obeyed, but in ſubordination to the law of God; for I know not the Church but by the word, therefore, I cannot obey it but by it alſo. Secondly, Subjects ſhould not judge the law authoritatively: If thou judge the law thou art not a doer of it, *Iames* 4. 11. The word of God is the law, and all churches are ſubject

Pro. An. 3.

to

to it. Thirdly, The Text you cite the 17. of *Deut.* from the 8. v. to the 13, where the people are commanded to go to the Priests for decision of controversies, hath this *expressly* in it, *v.* 11. *According to the sentence of the law which he shall teach thee. Cajetan* upon the place sayeth, *That in the Hebrew it is super os legis, ideo doctrina eorum esset conformis divinæ legi.* There doctrine of decision should be warrandable by the law. *Glossa ordinaria* explaineth the place thus, *non dicitur tibi ut obedias, nisi juxta legem docuerint.* i. e. thou art not commanded to obey if they teach not according to the law: *Lyra* is of the same judgement, *si dicant falsum non sunt credendi*, if they speak false they are not to be believed: In *Mal.* 2. 7. The Lord sheweth that the *Priests lips should preserve knowledge*, where he declareth not what was, for they had gone out of the way at that time, but what should be. *Ribera* saith, the words are not to be read in the present, but in the future tense, and according to *Cyril*, he is called the *Messenger of the Lord*, because he should give men of the oracles of God, as he hath received them from the Lord. Also that place *Matth.* 23. 2. where *Church rulers* are appointed *to be heard when they sit in Moses chair. Theophylact* expoundeth it *quando docent ea quæ continentur in lege*,

when they teach the things contained in the law. O if your Scribes and Phariſees would do ſo, they might be better heard. That place 2. *Chr.* 19. 8. 11. concerning *Amaziah*, who was over them in all matters of the Lord, holdeth only forth this, that Magiſtracy and Miniſtry are diſtinct offices. And in the church of Jeruſalem, albeit the Apoſtles were infallible, yet they proceed according to the word, and built their ſentence on the Prophets, *Acts* 15. 14. theſe places prove, that implicit obedience is not to be given to any Church rulers. And the *Bereans* were commended for ſearching the Scriptures, when the meſſage was delivered to them. How groſs then is *Bellarmin*, who ſaith, † *Si Papa erraret præcipiendo vitia, & prohibendo virtutes, teneretur Eccleſia credere, virtutes eſſe malas & vitia bona.* If the Pope ſaith he, ſhould cõmend vice, and call it good (which they grant he may do, notwithſtanding of his infallibility) then people were bound to obey and call vice good. *Valentia* ſaith more, *that the people are bound without any enquiry, to erre with their rulers, and errores eorum in tali cauſa ſunt actus Chriſtianæ obedientiæ*, their errours are acts of Chriſtian obedience; *Æternæ vitæ meritoriæ*, deſerving eternal life. When Papiſts ſpeak ſo great abſurdities, what will they not do for their intereſt?

† *Bell. lib. 4. de Pont. cap. 5.*

Valent. Tom. 3. diſp. 1. & diſp. 7. qu. 3. Punct. 2.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, As to the fourth thing propo- *Pro. Au.*
ſed, the Church of Chriſt is to be ruled by its 4.
officers lawfully called, but the government of it here is not Monarchical but Ariſtocratical. Under the New Teſtament the Lord appointed no viſible Monarch on earth, to be an officer in his church; for our laſt appeal in dubious caſes is regulated by that well known Scripture *Matth.* 18. 17. *If he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as a publican*; Now it is abſurd to ſay, that this ſhould be the ſenſe of it, *tell the Pope*, for in no language the word *Church* can ſignifie a viſible Monarch. Secondly, The council of Jeruſalem maketh not for this, for not only proceed they upon Scripture grounds, but although they were infallible men, yet none of them took the Papal way, and the government was not Monarchical, *It ſeemed good to the holy Ghoſt and us*. Thirdly, Church power is Miniſterial, *Matth.* 20. 25. 26. 2. *Cor.* 1. 24. 1. *Pet.* 5. 3. but Monarchy is Magiſterial, therefore it agreeth not with church power. And when Papiſts reaſon for the power of the church and mention councils the argument may be thus propounded, church officers, councils, have been appointed to rule and order the affairs of the houſe of God, *Ergo*, they may do what they will and who can ſay unto them what doſt thou.

See Biſh. Laud. againſt Fiſher.

I deny the *consequence*. *Ergo*, the Pope is one of these officers, it is absolutly refused. And this is *summa totalis*, of the prolix answer to the fourth question, which may be taken away with a word. *Ergo*, if the word make not for them, then they may betake themselves to their own traditions and rule by them. That is denyed also by us. And suppose they should give the Law to their own Vassals, will it therefore follow that they empire it over the whole Christian-church? And seeing all churches are bound to a rule, can any be infallible which have need of a rule? When you make the Pope your church, do ye not build your faith on him? Is this like the foundation, *Eph.* 2. 20.? What is this but to make your faith humane? And is it not absurd to say that *Alexander the sixth Pope Iohn*, 22. in the *cathedra* were infallible as the Prophets and Apostles in dyting Scripture, they cannot blush who speak so.

Fifthly, As for the fifth particular, viz. That place of *Augustin*, *cont. ep. fund. cap.* 5. *I would not have believed the Scripture, unless the authority of the church had moved me.* Our Divines have answered fully long ago, so it is a threed bare argument: for he speaketh not there concerning the formal reason, why Scripture is believed; but concerning the mean and motive, by which in-

Pro. An. 5.

trants

trants are brought at first to the knowledge of the Scripture, (I mean the confused knowledge of the Scripture) as when a man delivereth a letter he may tell from whom it is, but the faith of it is from the subscription. So here then, by the church, he understandeth not the church or Pope of Rome, but the Primitive-church of the faithful, which did hear & see Christ and his Apostles. So saith *Durand* † he had to do with the *Manichees*, who would make him believe their Gospel. *No* saith he, *the testimony of those who did see with their eyes, hear with their ears, and handle the word of life, is to be preferred to your assertion*, and this is a motive which made me at first quite *Manichism*, and close with the Gospel of Christ, so speaketh *Melchior Canus lib. 2. de loc. cap. 8.* therefore it maketh nothing for the imperious supremacie of the Pope or Church in matters of faith, for there is a difference between *cõmunia motiva fidei*, and *formalis ratio credendi*. See learned and perspicuous *Dr. Barron against Turnebul, Tract. 4. & pag.* 188. Who hath unanswerably demonstrated this truth, and so interpreteth these words of *Augustin*, The testimony of the church is a principle inductive, and a motive to new intrants, to read, hear, and consider the holy Scriptures, and it produceth only an humane faith:

† *Dur. lib. dist. 24. qu. 1.*

the

the inward testimony of the holy Spirit is the principle effective of divine faith, and the Scriptures themselves are the formal reason and terminative principle, whereinto divine faith is resolved, as a building upon its foundation. *Eph.* 2. 20. To conclude this answer, We judge that the pure Gospel Church is, and should be the pronouncer of divine sentence from the Scripture; that the authority of Councils should be interposed for making men willing and obedient to the divine law: so should the Magistrat concurre in his station for that effect. But the church of Rome is not pure, not like that which once it was in the Apostle Paul his time, and at no time could she be called the Universal church, far less now. Albeit then her faith was spoken of throughout all the world. Is this a good argument, the faith of the Church of *Brittain* is mentioned throughout all the reformed churches of *Transylvania*, *Hungaria*, *Polland*, *Germany*, *Bohemia*, *Flanders*, *France*, *and Helvetia*, therefore it is the Universal-church, no, we claim no more but to be a Sister church to these in the confession of faith, according to the Scriptures, and all together make up the Universal-church. And any one of these is preferable to the church at Rome, as it is now corrupted and apostatized. Will ye hear *Albertus Pighius*

† *Alb. Pighius, lib. 6. Eccl. hierarc. cap. 3.*

Pighius, *Quis unquam per Romanam Ecclesiam intellexit universalem*, who ever did by the Roman Church understand the Church universal. Why do ye then speak so, and ambitiously empire it over all the world?

Question fifth, *Seeing no Scripture is of privat interpretation*, 2. Pet. 1. 20. *should privat men take upon them to interpret the same?* Pa. Qu. 5.

Answer, The sense of that text is, no scripture is the indytment of a privat spirit, but proceedeth from the holy Ghost, for it followeth, *holy men of GOD spake as they were moved by the holie Ghost, and it came not of old by the will of men.* Therefore it is no ways to be thought, that privat men should be barred from searching the Scripture seeing Christ Jesus commanded the contrar, *Io.* 5. 39. This was spoken to a whole multitude of persecuting Jews. The word is the sword of the spirit *Eph.* 6. 17. should any privat man be disarmed amongst his foes? And blessed is he whither privat or publict, who meditateth in the law of the Lord day and night. *Ps.* 1. Pro. An.

Reply, *In your fifth answer you grant with the Apostle, that no prophecie of the Scripture is of any privat interpretation; so should you grant also, that the Scriptures cannot be rightly expounded of every privat spirit, and fancie of the vulgar Reader, but by the same* Pa. Rep.

ſpirit wherewith they were written which reſolveth in the Church. And I am very confident no learned or wiſe Proteſtant *will allow any privat man to expound ſcripture, againſt the common conſent of the whole Catholick Church, wherein they were immediatly before: But you inſiſt, that it is not to be thought that privat men ſhould be barred from ſearching the ſcripture, ſeeing it is contrar to that text,* John 5. 39. *where if by* ſearching the Scripture, *you mean the reading and interpretation of it, that cannot be the ſenſe of it. For the Apoſtle* Paul ſaith, 1. Cor. 12. GOD hath ſet in the Church Prophets, Apoſtles, Doctors, &c. *Then he addeth,* are all Apoſtles, are all Prophets, are all Doctors, do all interpret? Then *this doth not belong to every man to read and interpret Scripture, but to ſearch the deep meaning and ſenſe thereof from the Doctors of the Church. For the Jews did ſearch the ſcripture, reading and hearing it read in their Synagogues, and yet did deny Chriſt to be the* Meſſiah, *which ſcripture doth clearly teſtifie. Even as* Proteſtants *do read Scripture, and in it* the real preſence, the power to forgive ſins granted to men, juſtification by faith and good works, anointing the ſick, virginity preferred to marriage, *and yet deny all this: Wherefore as Chriſt exhorteth the Jews, to do it with greater reflection and attention, not*

ſuperficially

ſuperficially, turning and ſhuffling it over as Proteſtants *do, ſo do I exhort them. The word is the ſword of the ſpirit, upon which you inferre,* ſhould any privat man be diſarmed amongſt his foes. *So let me tell you that the Apoſtle calling it a ſword, ſheweth that it ſhould not be put into a mad mans hand, or in the hand of a fool. i. e. Poor ignorants who as* Peter *ſaith, wreſt it to their own deſtruction, and yet this is your conſequence, if it ſhould be granted to all privat men. Children and fools get not arms amongſt their foes, wherewith they might rather wrong themſelves then their enemies, but are under the protection of their Padagogues and attendants. And ſo the ignorant ſhould not eaſily handle the ſword of the word, being ignorant, and only capable of the letter, but ſhould receive the ſenſe thereof from the Church and her Paſtors, that it may be to them an arme of defence.*

Pro. Duply. 1.

Anſwer firſt, All this is anſwered fully in the return of the firſt queſtion, to which place I referre the Reader, leſt I make idle repetition: If the rule of right reaſoning had been obſerved, nothing of this ought to have come in formerly, but here in its own proper place. I diſtinguiſhed betwixt privat men and privat interpretations, then, betwixt the extraordinar gift of interpreting and the ordinar. Thirdly, Betwixt the priviledge

and the exercise. Privat men have the priviledge to search the Scriptures, you say it should be by no other then doctors; if that be true, then the Lord Jesus did not direct the people who heard him, to use prayer and meditation for knowing the Scriptures, but to go to their rulers, Scribes and Pharisees, who did what they could to make the Scriptures testifie against him and all his. I appeal to the conscience or reason of any, if this exposition on the place can bold water? Or if an indvidual act, such as this, being performed by another is an obedience to a command? If this exposition be good, then when the Lord pronounceth *the man blessed, who meditats in the Law day and night*; the sense of it must be if his Pastors do it for him it is enough? Who will admit this? But the one is as true as the other.

Pro. An. 2. *Secondly*, You contradict your self, for once you say that privat men should not interpret Scripture, but take it from the mouth of the church: then immediatly you exhort them to do it, not superficially, but with attention, and we exhort to no more.

Pro. An. 3. *Thirdly*, You make all the people who are privat men, mad fools and Children by your cõparison, in whose hand the word of GOD should not be put, then it must be taken from them; and how agreeth this with the former

former exhortation ? What if this were told to the Kings and Queens who are Popish ? By the testimony of your doctors, ye are allde clared unfit to rule others, for mad men fools & children cânot govern. In effect ye guide thẽ as such in divine matters, for ye muzle, and blindfold the people, all this passeth under the notion of Pædagogy. But sad is the case of such pupils, if they knew what belonged to their peace. Let ignorants be catechised, and trained in the ways of GOD, this may make them more discerning of the sense and meaning of the word of God. *Seneca* telleth, *Cœnant nobiscum quidam quia sunt docti, alii ut sint docti.* Some men suppe with us because they are learned, others that they may be learned. *The testimonies of the Lord make wise the simple*, should they then be deprived of them.

Question sixth, *Ye agree not about the rule, for some cast at the* Epistle of James, *others receive it ?* *Pa. Qu.* 6.

Answer, None of the pure reformed do so, it was only rejected by some *Lutherians* in which we do not owne them. *Pro. Ans.*

Secondly, The number of Scripture books is not the question, but whither these mantained by all be the rule of faith ? Seeing all men are mutable creatures and at their best state vanity: *Popes* clash with *Popes*, *Councils* with

with Councils, Pulpits with Pulpits, let any judge whither it be safest that the revealed will of God be our rule, or the dictats of self contradicting men?

Pa. Reply. *Reply, You say none of these pure reformed, reject the Epistle of* James, *and you disclaime the* Lutherians *who do so, and they you; for I am confident they will acknowledge none for pure reformers, who take an Epistle for scripture which they hold to be none. Then you say, the number of Scripture books is not the question, Sir, you move questions as you please, but hear* Mr. Hooker *one of your most learned* Protestants, lib. 1. Eccl. pol. Sect. 14. pag. 36. *of these things necessar saith he, the very chief is to know what books we esteem holy, which is impossible for it self to teach. Apply this to your only determiner of faith, in your first answer. And truely I think this should be the first question of all, to the pure reformed, according to the pure word of God, as you cal them, which are the books of the pure word of GOD? Now if you answer, these are maintained by all which you make the rule of faith, how few books of Scripture shal be this rule, if any at all? For there be few or none whereof some have not doubted or flatly denyed.* Saint Augustin contra Faustum Manichæum, *and* lib. de mor. Eccl. cap. 1. *Saith, the* Manichees *did deny* Moses *and the Prophets, the*

Jews

Jews did deny the New Testament? What books of Scripture are maintained by all? For by that, you make the consent of all judge of canonical Scripture, how then can you disclaim tradition, and say immediatly after men are mutable creatures, and at their best state vanity? Seeing upon the consent of men ye take up your rule of faith, and number of Scripture books. I know other Protestants *alleadge for this, that the books of Scripture like the Sun shew themselves to be such, to him who hath the spirit. But I would ask at such, why the* Rev. St. James Epistle, the second of St. Peter, and two of St. John, *did not shew themselves to be Scripture to* Luther, *that spiritual man, and the* Protestants *very first Apostle in the work of reformation; in the end you say,* Let any judge whither it be safest that the revealed will of God be your rule and determiner, or the dictats of self contradicting creatures? *Where you seem to rubbe on Catholicks: But Sir, this toucheth not them at all, for they profess not to believe self-contradicting creatures, but the unanimous consent of Councils and fathers, or the Catholick Church, known to be the only Church established by Christ and his Apostles, and by the continued succession of Popes, Bishops, and Pastors, the unity, universality, and gifts of miracles, in all ages, &c. Which Christ hath called*

the

the ground and pillar of truth. 1. Tim. 3. 15. and against which he assureth us the gates of hell shal not prevail, Math. 16. 18. *and which he hath commanded us to hear, otherwise to be holden as heathens and publicans,* Math. 18. 17. *so you see, that the written word maketh the Church our judge, which we should obey, and that ye who make so much of the written word, do not believe it when ye do not obey her. And here I remarke that* Protestant *Ministers and preachers deceive the people, in that they ground their faith on the written word only, and Roman Catholicks say they on humane tradition, and their Churches authority, which being composed of men is subject to errour. Whereas the contrar is true, for Roman Catholicks believe nothing which the written word (believing both the tradition of the Church and Apostles) doth not expresly warrand. As for the Church, what is more expresly said then what I have cited, both to prove that we are bound to hear her,* Mat. 18. 18. *and hold her authority infallible.* Math. 16. 18. *and the house of God which is the pillar and ground of truth,* 1. Tim. 3. 15. *Neither doth it avail you to say, this is not said of the Roman Church, which is not the universal Church, but a particular one a strumpet, &c. For we speak not of any particular Church, when we say that the Church*

is

is infallible, nor when we say the Roman, the Catholick, do we understand the particular Church at Rome? But that Church which professeth constantly the Romans faith, spread in saint Pauls *time through all the world. As we call yet the Roman Empire that which hath its seat in Vien of Austria. Yea,* Protestants *calling their own the reformed Church, cannot say but we have one Church on earth, which Christ commanded us to hear constantly. And if the reformed Church be the true Church, then she must have taken the place from that church which was deformed, and had fallen into an errour, and so deserved no more to be called the pillar and ground of truth, or to be heard. Moreover, the very pillars of the* Protestant *Religion, grant all the world to be in an errour before themselves, and so against the expreſs written Word must deny the infallibility of any Church whatever. For* Calv. Instit. lib. 4. cap. 18. *saith, they made all the Kings and People of the earth drunk from the first to the last, and* Hospinian epist. 41. *saith,* Luthers *separation was from all the world.* White in his defence chap. 37. *saith, Popery was a leprosie breeding so universally in the church, that there was no visible company of men free from it.* Jewel in his Sermon on Luke 11. *The whole world, Princes, and people were overwhelmed by ignorance, and*

bound by oath to the Pope; which if it be true that the Church in former ages did erre, the reformed Church may erre, that themselves do not deny. Thence it followeth clearly, that the Protestant *Church is not the house of GOD called the pillar and ground of truth, that she is not Christs Church, against which the gates of hell shal not prevail, that none are bound to hear her in matters of faith, being subject to errour. And so* Protestants *may well desire men to read the Scripture and believe what they found there, but not urge any man to follow their doctrine, but in so far as they find it conforme to Scripture, which all Roman Catholicks protest they do not. As for traditions, are we not commanded to hold them in the clear written Word?* 2. Thess. 2. 15. Hold the traditions which ye have learned, whither by word or our epistle. Protestants *read* documents, *but* documents *by word and traditions are the same thing, on which place* Chrysost: saith, It is evident that the Apostle did not deliver all things by writ, but many things by word which are worthy of credit as wel as the other. *That is Christs word as well as his writ, therefore we call them divine and Apostolical traditions,* Aug. lib. 5. de Trinit. cap. 23. *speaking of rebaptization,* The Apostle, *saith he,* commanded nothing of it, but that custome which is believed to proceed from the

the Apostle, is opposed against Cyprian, in it, as many things are which the whole Church holdeth, and therefore are believed to be commanded by the Apostles, though not written. *And in the first age, saint* Dennis chap. 1. *speaking of the Ecclesiastick hierarchy, saith,* These our chief captains of Priestly function, did deliver to us the chiefest and supersubstantial points, partly in written, partly in unwritten institutions. Epiph. Hæres. 61. *is of the same minde,* we must hold traditions, *saith he,* for the Scripture hath not all things; *and* Tertullian de præscript: *grounds his faith on the authority of the Church, and what tradition I believe, saith he, I received from the present Church, the present Church from the primitive, that from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ. Here I hope you see you must either admit traditions as necessary in themselves and infallible in their authority, or else disclaim both Scripture and Fathers. All that* Protestants *can say either against the authority of the Church, in general Councils, or Apostolick traditions delivered by her, is, that all her decisions and traditions flow from men, and so are not infallible. But I answer, neither were the Prophets, Apostles, Evangelists who penned the Scripture, but men, yet I hope their writtings are not fallible or subject to errour: Because they were inspired directly*

and assisted by the Spirit of God. The Fathers of the Church have to this day that promise verified to them, Math. 28. 20. *which was made as well to their successours as to themselves. As for that some* Protestants *speak of an invisible Church composed of the Elect, it is but a shift to delude the ignorant, for as it is a Maxime of law,* Idem est non esse & non apparere, i. e. *it is the same not to be, and not to appear to be in the matter of any pretended right, so in the matter of doctrine, an invisible Church and no Church is the same. For if I cannot see nor know the Elect, as being invisible to the eye of man, so I cannot know that the Church composed of them speaketh to me, or that this Doctrine I hear of any man is infallible, more then that he is one of the Elect.*

Protest. Duply. *Answer,* I am weary transscribing a number of words without weight, that is a compleet rapsodie, and no return to the former question: If such digressions were heard in the School, the Writter beboved to be sore censured. The question was, how the Scripture could be the square? Seeing all agree not about the number of the books, some cast at the Epistle of *James* as the *Lutherans.* And the answer I gave was, that although some *Lutherans* differre from us, about the authority of that epistle: yet we both

both agree here, that uncontroverted ſcripture is the determiner. And for the numerick queſtion, it was ſufficiently anſwered in the ſecond anſwer to the firſt querie; ſo we needed not this tautologie to make the Reader nauſeat. If I had to do with a *Lutheran*, then I could prove the divine authority of that Epiſtle, but you do not deny it, therefore to what purpoſe ſhould I inſiſt on that ſubject againſt you. *Mr. Hooker* whom you cite, maketh nothing againſt us as is alledged, for that which he ſayes, is firſt, that the light of reaſon rightly managed, is a requiſit mean for the knowledge of ſcripture books, and what ſayeth that againſt us, ſeeing we ſuppoſe the Readers of Scripture to be rational men, & that reaſon in its own line may be helpful to them for underſtanding ſcripture. Secondly, *Mr. Hooker* directly diſclaimeth your traditions, page 86. and affirmeth, that they who betake themſelves to that teſtimonie as divine, have not the truth, but are in an errour. Thus he condemneth you as erronious, ſo it had been your advantage, to have ſpared this tradition: neither was it needful to tell us, that the *Manichees* denyed *Moſes*, and the *Jews* the *New Teſtament*. We have to do with Papiſts, who hold all the books of the *Old* and *New Teſtament*, which we hold for Canonick. At leſt

lest what some others make disputable, as *Melchior Canus* telleth us, you put it out of dispute, so you are not in *bona fide* to reason about their number with us, seeing ye question none which we maintaine, albeit we justly call in question Apocryphal writtings, which ye put into the Canon. Is it not safer to regulate our faith by these uncontroverted Scriptures, then by the dictats of mutable self-contradicting Popes? When Church Rulers have been fully corrupted, Believers have continued orthodoxe, as in the time of the Arrian persecution. The Fathers who lived the first 300. year, believed without either Pope or General Council as propounders of their faith. For then there was no such pretending to infallible supremacy. They had no infallible testimony from the Church, they acknowledged not her testimony to be such. And for ought I can learn, there be no testimony of your Church, nor statute enacting her testimony to be infallible. If so it is not according to you *de fide*, however ye make a great noise amongst people with it. And if all the faith you have, depend upon the testimony of the present Church, which is your doctrine, your faith is not one with Abrahams faith, for the word of God did beget his faith, but it is the testimony & statute of the *Trent Council* that

begetteth

begetteth yours, and I would gladly heat from you, whither there was universal consent there or not? Such clashing and pocket orders, as the author of that history telleth to the world, will not permit you to say, without a blush, that the Council was unanimous and Gospel-like in their way. Therefore, unless it be against us, all their otheracts are made up of ambiguous stuffe, like the Delphian responses, this is purposely cõtrived to cover debates with general termes. And if their testimony, make the word of GOD Scripture to me living under Popery, what rule had they for their faith who made these conclusions? Their own testimony could not be the cause of their own belief: if you say that the testimonie of the ancient Church was their rule, then ye go contrar to your own Doctors, who declare that the present Church of Rome is above all former councils, and their authority dependeth on her testimony. See *Bell. lib. de Eccl. cap.* 10. *Valentia Tom.* 3. *disp.* 1. *quest.* 1. Further that the supream power of judging is not in the Council but in the Pope, that he is above a generalCouncil, that he cannot be subject to it. See *Bell. lib.* 2. *de Concil cap.* 17. *Valentia tom.* 3. *disp.* 1. *Suarez disp.* 5. *de fide*, and your own *Vives* in his comment on *Augustins* 20. *book de civit. Dei cap.* 26. telltho

leth us how little ye make of Councils, or of the ancient Church when they militat against you. *Illa demum videntur iis Concilia quæ in rem suam faciunt, reliqua non pluris æstimantur quam commenta mulierum in textrina aut thermis.* i. e. These appear to be Councils to them, which make for them, the rest are no more esteemed by them, then the fables of old women in the weavers shop or stove. *Brisacerius* writting against *Collat.* a *Jansenist* as he is cited by learned *Dallous* †, saith, Councils are *literæ mortuæ nisi animentur à præsenti Ecclesia.* i. e. They are dead letters if they be not animated by the present Church. This appeareth to be true from experience, for ye agree not with the primitive, either in doctrine, worship, or government. The ancients thought that Images should not be in the Church. See *Epiph. epist. ad Iohannem Hierosolymitanum, ὅτι εἶδον εἰκόνα cum vidissem Imaginem pendere in Ecclesia contra authoritatem Scripturæ.* i. e. When I saw an Image hang in the Church contrar to the authority of Scripture how grieved was I. But the Council of *Trent* appointed them to be had in houses and Churches, and that *debitus honor & reverentia eis impertiatur* i. e. Due honor and worship be given to them. The Fathers thought that the *Virgin Marie* was conceived in sin

† *See Dalleus de usu Patrum*

Sess. 25.

so

ſo ſaith *Ambroſe*, *Auguſtin*, *Chryſoſtom*, as *Melchior Canus de loc. Theol. lib.* 7. telleth. The Council of *Trent*, *Seſſ.* 5. will not conclude her under Original ſin. The Fathers excluded *Tobias*, *Judith*, *Wiſdom*, *Eccleſiaſticus*, and both the books of the *Maccabees*, out of the canon of Scripture. So did *Hierom in his prologue ad libros Solomonis. Epiph. lib. de Pond. & menſ. cap.* 2. *pag.* 162. *Gregorie Nazianzen. carm.* 3. *Athanaſius epiſt. feſt.* But the Council of *Trent* anathematizeth them, who exclude theſe books out of the *Canon*, *Seſſ.* 4. Baptiſm was delayed till Paſch and Pentecoſt in the primitive Church, it is not ſo with you. The 4. *Council of Carthage* did forbide women to baptize, *Canon* 100. ye allow it. The Sacrament was adminiſtred in the primitive Church to all preſent, and they who did not partake were appointed to remove. *Ite miſſa eſt*, *exite foras qui non vultis accipere Sacramentum.* i. e. Go, it is cloſed, go forth ye that will not receive the Sacrament: Now the words are muttered and adminiſtred before all. They took with their hand, and the bread was broken of old: Now it is not, for ye make whole wafers, and put them into their mouth. For fourthteen hundred years the Church appointed the Sacrament to be adminiſtred by bread and wine to the people, all Chriſtians

ſtians of whatever judgement, except Papiſts do ſo communicat as yet, *Petau. de ponit. pub. lib.* 2. ſheweth that it cannot be denyed, *niſi ab homine inſigniter & ſupra omnem modum vel impudenti vel imperito*: i. e. Except by a man remarkably and above all meaſure either impudent, or unskilful, that this was the primitive practiſe, yet the *Council of Conſtance hoc non obſtante*, and the *Council of Trent* decree the contrar. The primitive Church heard nothing of the Popes univerſal ſupremacie, or infallibility, which now by you is made *Summa rei*. See *Cyprian ep.* 55. to *Cornelius Biſhop of Rome*, and how he ſtileth him *frater*, &c. and he ſaith, that they were formerly choſen to officiat, *Non ſine conſenſu plebis*, not without the Popes conſent *ep.* 68. *Ipſa plebs habet poteſtatem* &c. Is not this far from your imperious pompous way of Monarchy? how then can you ſo boldly averre, that ye have the unanimous conſent of Councills and fathers for you, when indeed ye do not regard them ſo much as we. Hear your own *Cornelius, Muſ.* † *ep. Bitont. in ep. ad Rom. cap* 14. *Ego ut ingenue fateor, plus uni ſummo pontifici crederem, in his quæ fidei miſteria tangunt, quam mille Hieronymis, Auguſtinis, Gregoriis. Credo enim & ſcio, quod ſummus Pontifex, in his quæ fidei ſunt errare non poteſt, quia auctori-*

† See Dallæus ubi ſupra.

tas

tas determinandi quæ ad fidem spectant in Pontifice residet. i. e. That I may ingenuously confesse, I would give more credit to one Pope, in the things which belong to the misteries of truth, then to a thousand such as *Augustin*, *Jerom*, or *Gregory*. For I know certainly that the *Pope* cannot erre in these things that belong to faith, because the authority of determining matters of faith resideth in the Pope; yet ignorant people are made to believe that Papists have the consent and practise of the primitive Church along with them, and *Melchior Canus*, *loc. Theol. lib. 7. cap. 3. num. 10. Sequi majores nostros per omnia, & in illorum vestigiis pedes nostros figere, ut pueri faciunt per lusum, nihil aliud est quam ingenia nostra damnare, judicio nos privare nostro & facultate inquirendæ veritatis.* i. e. to follow our ancestors in all things, and to trace their footsteps,, and fixe in them as children use to do in play, is no other thing but to condemn our own wit, and to deprive our selves of our own judgement, and faculty of searching the truth. *Salmeron in cap. 5. epist. ad Rom. disp. 5.* asserteth, *quo juniores eo perspicaciores sunt doctores*, and citeth *Exod. 23. follow not the multitude* viz. of ancients. This is sufficient to prove, that as the Papists are jealous of Scripture, so are they of the Primitive

Church her consent. But it is alleadged, that ye have the word of God for your warrand; *Matth.* 16. 18. *Matth.* 18. 18. 1. *Tim.* 3. 15. To this I answere, that the first Text, is meaned of the collective body of the Church, which fall not away; this is clear from the context, for it is the Church builded on that confession mentioned by the Apostles: and an house so builded cannot fall, because it is builded on a rock, *Matth.* 7. 25. Yet it will not follow that there be no drops in it; for particular beleevers cannot totally and finally fall away, but that they are infallible who can say? see *John* 10. 28. and compare it with 1. *Cor.* 13. 9. *James* 3. 2. beside, your own writters interpret it so, see *Melchior Canus lib.* 5. *de loc. Theol. cap.* 5. and *Panormitan* on the place.

The second Text *Mat.* 18. is to be understood of a particular Church, which you grant is not infallible, so *Chrysostom* interpreteth the place, and it is further clear from the Connexion, for it is the Church, to which appeals should be made *in prima instantia*, this undoubtedly is a particular Church. But admitting that it is meaned of the universal church, your Pope nor your Church is not it.

The third Text 1. *Tim.* 3. 15. holdeth forth no more then what is granted in the answer to the fourth question, or if you please

to

to take learned *Cameron* his expoſition, who knitteth theſe words with the 16. verſe, you may do well. But what ever be the priviledges of the true Goſpel Church, which is the Bride of Jeſus Chriſt, Rome hath forefaulted all theſe, and is but a leprous part of the univerſal Church, you grant that the church of Rome is but a particular church. Why plead you then for the whole priviledges of the univerſal Church? Is not this abſurd arrogance? Nor doth *Calvin*, *Hoſpinian*, *Luther* or *White*, ſpeak abſolutly as ye alleadge, but aſſert that the generality for a time was leavened by Popery which is truth. But what then followeth? That the myſterie of iniquity did ariſe by degrees and over-runne all for the moſt we grant, ſo did the *Arrian* hereſie; therefore was not *Athanaſius*, and ſuch as adhered to the truth, right in their way? The whole world in the Apoſtles time did ly in wickedneſs, 1. *Iohn* 5. 19. Therefore were they not Sons of truth who endeavoured a Goſpel reformation. Your laſt hold is tradition, and you ſay, we are commanded to hold them. 2. *Theſ.* 2. 15. for this you cite *Aug. Cyprian*, *St. Dennis*, *Epiphanius*. To this I anſwer, we are not againſt Apoſtolick traditions, nor Church hiſtory in matters of fact, We make uſe of traditions there mentioned: But for your Legends

Legends, we deny that they are such and disclaim them. Have you Sir learned Logick? Why do you argument so, *a genere ad speciem affirmative*? Is this a good argument, *Est animal, ergo est homo, he is a living creature, therefore he is a man*? Can this be better, *there were traditions delivered to the Church of Thessalonica, ergo, yours are these, Credat Judæus Appella?* Secondly, If there were unwritten traditions, why do you dare to writ these things which the Apostles would not writ? Thirdly, Will that argue the Scripture of imperfection? You may as well argue, the Minister writteth a book the summe of which he hath preached to people, *Ergo*, his book is imperfect. You have then to prove for your end, that these traditions mentioned, 2. *Thess.* 2. 15. were about matters of faith. Secondly, If so they be no where written in Scripture. Thirdly, That if they be not written, they be the same which ye deliver to the people, and by what authority ye press and writ them. But to take this text wholly from your mis-interpretation, hear *Theodoret*, who saith, *that the Apostle spake not of diverse doctrines, but of the same diversely delivered.* For first he preached to the *Thessalonians*, and then did writ the substance of it. But as where ever ye find fire in the Scripture ye make it Purgatory, so

where

where ye find tradition, ye make it *pari ratione* yours: Will ye listen to *Bell. lib. 4. de verbo Dei cap.* 10. and he will put all out of doubt, for he granteth that all in substance were written by the Apostles, which they preached to the people, or were necessar to salvation, *Cyprian in his epist. ad Pompeium*, admitteth not any traditions, but such as may be perceived to be in the Evangels, in the Epistles or Acts of the holy Apostles. Therefore it is a perfect rule to all discerners say I, and no more was at first asserted. Your Maxime *Idem est non esse & non apparere*, holdeth in law but not in divinity. For the soul is not visible yet who can deny the being of it. What is more in the Reply I judge not worthy the noticeing, and I am forced to make digression, because of an impertinent return. Is it not strange, that when I called men mutable creatures, and at their best frate vanitie, subject to clashing contradiction, and that the written Word is the only infallible rule for direction: that upon this tradition, universal consent, should be so prolixely commented on without any connexion. They who follow this reflecter must resolve to deviat from the high way.

Question seventh, *Your Church which ye call reformed is but of yesterday, where was it before* Luther? *Papists Quest.* 7.

Answer,

Prote-stants Answer. *Answer*, It is as old in its doctrinals as the Scripture, therefore not of yesterday. See what societie from the beginning professed the doctrine mantained there, that was our Church. The *Romans*, *Corinthians*, *Ephesians*, *Philippians*, *Thessalonians*, as taught by the Apostle *Paul* are our Church of old, so it is not new. Secondly, In all ages there have been and are, eminent professours of that doctrine which we mantaine, as is abundantly proved by *Flaccus Illyricus* in his *Catalogue*, *Testium veritatis*, and learned *Dr. Usher in Successione Ecclesiæ reform* : which testimonies no Popish shaveling of what ever ordour, yet could answer. Thirdly, where was the church of Rome as now constituted, before the council of Trent ? Nay more, was the Popes supremacy and infallibility heard of the 600 year after Christ ? Is not all Popish faith as such resolved into a lie, viz. the infallibility of the Pope or Council, which though errand untruths are the key of the Popish Religion. Fourthly, All the positives of the reformed Religion, were mantained substantially in the Primitive church, the first 300. years, (I speake not of changeable circumstances, nor integrals, but essentials) and the negatives could not be there, because the controversies were not then started. But ye Papists have amassed a body of humane inventions

inventions, & grosse errours contrare to scripture, obtruding them under *Anathema*, to be the established doctrine of the Church. And because we of the reformed Profession will not own these, and call that which is new old, ye excommunicat us as Hereticks.

Reply, *In your seventh Answere you say, your doctrine is as old as scripture, and your Church as the Apostles; and this is common to you with all sectaries to claime the scripture and the Church, in the time of the Apostles. And like to that answer of the common people, we are all come of* Adam *and* Eve. *But I shall let you presently see, how contrar your doctrine is to that scripture, and how unlike your Church is to that of the Apostles the first 300 year. In the second part ye pretend that* Illyricus *and* Doctor Usher *have sufficiently shewed that there have been eminent men of your Profession in all ages, and that without a Reply of any Popish shaveling of whatever ordour. But Sir, I am sorrie that you who are a Nazarian and not a shaveling, should be so ill versed in books of controversie, as not to have seen so many Catholick writters who demonstrat clearly, that of all these eminent men before* Calvin *you pretend to be yours, there is not one, hath holden all the same tenets with you and no more. For it is enough for you, that they dissent from the Church of Rome,* Papists Reply.

and fling at the Popes authority, what ever tenets they hold in matters of belief, to call them yours. Which hath made Dr. Vane *Chaplain to our late King, judiciously compare them to* Sampsons *foxes, which were all bound together by the tails, although their heads went diverse wayes. So that when you call the* Lutherans, Valdenses, Albigenses, Hussites, Catharists, Wickleffians, Græcians, Egyptians *yours, you may as well call the* Turks *and* Tartars *yours; if we trust all records which speake of their tenets. And as for the Fathers, hear if they were yours in the opinion of the most learned* Protestants. Dudithius apud Bezam, ep. 1. If that be true which Papists say, the Fathers with mutual consent are altogether on their side. Pet. Martyr 2. de verbo col. 1539. as long as we stand to Councils and fathers we shal alwayes remain in the same errours. *And fully confesseth that* Hierom, Ambrose *and* Augustin, *held the invocation of Saints,* Chemnitius in ex. concil. trid. art. 3. pag. 100. *did not dispute but avouch, that most of the Fathers, said the souls of the Martyrs, heard the petition of those that prayed to them, they went to monuments and invocated Martyrs by name.* Whitgift in his defence, pag. 473. all the Bishops and writers of the Greek and Latine Church too, *(who no doubt were the Fathers)* for the most

part

part were ſpotted with the doctrine of Free-will, Merit, Invocation of Saints. *Judge then Sir if they were pure. In the third part you ask*, where was the Church of Rome before the council of Trent? *I anſwer you, even where ſhe is now, except in* Iappony, India, China, *and ſome parts of* America, *where by their Chriſtian labours, and by the bleſſing of GOD ſhe hath been eſtabliſhed ſince. Neither can you inſtance that ſhe is not conſtantly the ſame in all points. Nay more ſay you*, was the Popes infallible univerſal ſupremacie heard of the firſt 600. years. *Where it ſeems you muſt be very deaf, who hear not the voice of* 1200. *Fathers ſpeaking only in the four firſt general Councils.* He who holdeth the See of Rome, is chief and head of all Patriarchs ſaith right, ſeeing he is the firſt, as Peter, to whom all power is given over all Chriſtian Princes, and all their people, and who ever contradicteth this, is excommunicated. Can. 29. Concil. Nicæni anno 325. *Where* 316 *Biſhops were conveened. Secondly, Of* 150. *Biſhops in the firſt Council of* Conſtantinople, anno 381. *Where the Biſhop of* Conſtantinople *is decreed to be the chief next the Biſhop of Rome. Thirdly, Of* 200. *Biſhops in the firſt council of* Epheſus, anno 431. *where in the* third action *it is defined, that ſaint* Peter *was the head and prince of the Apoſtles, and that the power*

of binding and loosing is granted to him, who in his successours liveth and exerciseth judgement unto this very day. Fourthly, Of 600. *Bishops in the* Chalcedon *council, in the year* 451. *where in the third action, also Pope* Leo *is called universal Bishop, Patriarch of old Rome, and sentence is pronounced against* Dioscorus *in the name of* Leo *and saint* Peter, *to acknowledge* Leo Peters *successour. The Fathers in particular I do not cite, for their citations in this would make a volumn. Only I engage that of a* 100. *there be* 90. *clear for this. And not one against it. Is not Popish faith resolved into a lie, say you, viz. the infallibility of Pope or Council? You should have said Pope and Council, putting them together as the head, and chief members, which represent the whole body of the Church; As the Parliament doth the whole Kingdome, and then if you doubt of their infallibility, you deny the expres words of Scripture, which calleth the Church the ground and pillar of truth,* 1. Tim. 3. *and which assureth us that the gates of hell shal not prevail against her.* Math. 16. 18. *Yea, you take away all possible means, to know infalliblie what is true Scripture, what is the true sense thereof, which is to make us doubt of all, and leave us no sufficient ground to believe undoubtedlie any thing. You take away Christs promise to be with the Church to the*

end

end of the world, Matth. 28. 20. *Yea*, *you take away an Article out of the Creed* (I believe in the holy Catholick Church) *and leaving men either to the dead letter of Scripture, which killeth many, or the privat ſpirit which deceiveth more, or natural reaſon which can be a motive of faith to none, you caſt looſe all Religion, every one rejecting or receiving Scripture as he pleaſeth. Expounding Scripture as he pleaſeth, and following in both no infallible rule or guide, but his own opinion, fancie & imaginatiõ. In the* fourth part *you ſay* that all the poſitives of the reformed Religion, were maintained in the primitive Church the firſt 300. years. *But if this were true, it would be made good no otherwiſe, but by the Fathers writtings in the firſt three ages after Chriſt. Now if they had all your poſitive tenets; why do your learnedeſt writters openly diſclaime them, as I have ſhewed formerly? Why ſaith* Luther *your Apoſtle*, lib. de ſerv. arbitrio, cap. 2. *the authority of the Fathers is not to be reguarded: and in his* Colloq. cap. de patribus. *In the writtings of* Hierom, *there is not a word of true faith, of* Chryſoſtom *I make no account*, Baſil *is of no worth, he is wholly a Monk*, Cyprian *is a weak Divine. But I muſt not inſiſt on this, becauſe you may in ſome meaſure deny the greateſt parts of controverted points, betwixt you and*

us to be positive tenets. Albeit there be none of them but justly may be called so. For you not only deny, for example, the real presence, invocation of Saints, use of Images, that a man is justified by faith and works, &c. *But ye positively believe*, that Christs Body and Blood is not reallie present in the Sacrament, that to invocat the Saints, is to give Gods worship to creatures, that to make use of Images, is idolatrie, that a man is not justified by faith only. *Therefore I instance only two upon which all your visible reformation is grounded. First*, That the whole visible Church may erre. *Secondly*, That we should believe nothing but what is in the written Word. *Now I have made it appear, reflecting on your sixt answer, that both these positive tenets are against the expres wordes of Scripture and Fathers. How then did the Church in the first* 300. *years, hold all the positives and what you affirme? As for your negatives, and what you deny, you grant they cannot be there, because the controversies were not then stated. But this is a bold and open calumnie, for not one point is denyed by you, but the Fathers in the first* 300. *years have clearlie asserted. And so the controversie betwixt you and us was sufficientlie stated even then. You deny real presence, and transubstantiation, but in the second age* Justin Martyr, Apol.

Apol. 2. ad Antonium *saies*, as Jesus Christ incarnat had flesh and blood for our redemption, so are we taught, that the Eucharist is the flesh and blood of the same Jesus incarnat. *And in the third age*, Cyprian serm. de cœna Domini, *saith*, the bread which the Lord gave to his Disciples, being changed not in shape, but in nature, by the omnipotencie of the Word is made flesh. *Secondlie, Ye deny the sacrifice of the Masse, asserted in the first age by* St. Andrew in the book of his passion *written by his Disciples*, I daily *saith he*, sacrifice the immaculat Lamb to Almightie GOD, who when he is truelie sacrificed, and his flesh eaten, remaineth intire and alive. *And in the third age by* Origen hom. 13. on Exod. *Ye think, your self guiltie, and worthilie if any part of the consecrated Host be lost by your negligence. Thirdlie, Ye deny* Purgatory *asserted in the* second age by Tertullian lib. de anima cap. 58, *seeing we understand* Matthews *prison which the Apostle demonstrats to be places below, and the least farthing is every smal fault delayed to be paied till the resurrection, none will doubt but the soul will recompense something in places below. And in the* third Age, It is one thing being cast into prison; not to go out thence till he pay the uttermost farthing, another, presently

ly to receive the reward of faith. One thing to be affected with long pains, for sins to be amended, and have all sins purged with suffering. sayeth Cyprian ep. 52. ad Antonium. *Fourthly, ye deny* Prayer for the dead, *allowed in the* first Age by S. Clemens ep. 1. de sancto Petro, *where he saith*, Peter there taught to give almes and pray for the dead. *And in the same age by* Tertul. lib. de cor. militis, we make yearly oblations for the dead. *Fifthly, ye deny* invocation of Saints and Angells, *recommended in the* second Age *by* S. Dennis Eccl. hierarch part. 3. cap. 3. *saying*, I constantly affirm, with the divine scripture, that the prayers of the saints are profitable for us in this life, after this manner, when a man is inflamed with a desire to invocat the saints, and distrusting his own weakness, betakes himself to any saint, beseeching him to be the helper and petitioner to God for him, he shall obtaine by that mean very great assistance. *And in the* third Age, Origen on the Lambent *sayeth*, Ile begin to fall on my knees and pray to all the saints, to succour me, who dare not ask God, for the exceeding greatness of my sin. O saints of God I beseech you with teares and weeping to fall down before his mercy seat for me wretch. *Sixthly, ye deny* the making of the sign of the Croß and Images, *but hear* S. Dennis lib. 2. Eccl. hierarch

hierarch. cap. 2. & 5. The ſign of the Croſs is ſo much honoured, that it is often uſed both in Baptiſm and other Sacraments. *And in the* third Age, Tertul. de cor. mil. cap. 3. In every thing, we ſign our forehead with the ſign of the Croſs, of which practiſe, tradition is the defender, cuſtome the conſerver, and faith the obſerver. *And againe the ſame* Tertul. lib. 2. de pudic. The Image of Chriſt bearing a Lamb on his ſhoulder, were graven on chalices, and uſed in Churches. *Seventhly, ye deny* Freewill, *which in the* ſecond Age, Irenæus lib. 4. cap. 72. *affirmeth*, not only in workes but even in faith, hath Almighty God reſerved liberty of will to man, ſaying, Be it done to thee according to thy faith. *And in the* third Age, S. Cyprian lib. 3. cap. 52. The freedom of believing or not believing is placed in the will. *Eyghtlie, ye denie* merit of workes, *but in the* ſecond Age, Juſtin Martyr Ap. 2. *boldeth it ſaying*, We think that men who by workes, have ſhewed themſelves worthy of the will and counſel of God, ſhall by their merits reign with him. *And in the* third Age, St. Cyprian ſect. de Eleemoſyna. If the day of your return ſhal find us unloaden, ſwift, and running in the way of good works, our Lord will not fail to reward our merits. *Ninthlie, Ye deny the* poſſibility of keeping the Commandments,

 againſt

against Tertul. *in the* second Age *cited by the Centuriſts, and* Origen in the 1. hom 9. on Iob. the baptized *ſaith he*, may fulfil the law in all things. *Iudge now Sir, whither it be not an open calumnie to ſay*, the controverſies betwixt you and us, were not then ſtarted in the firſt 300. years: *The Fathers having taught even then ſo clearlie our tenets, which nevertheleſs ye are not aſhamed to call new with Dr. Pierce in his Court ſermon, but ſee the two learned anſwers made to him, which may evidentlie convince you of boldneſs, ignorance, and errour.*

Prote-ſtants Reply.

Anſwer, You are wiſe by this your reply, for you leave the marrow of my anſwer untouched, which was this, *That our Church in Doctrinals, worſhip, &c. is as old as Scripture*. That you paſs with a jeer, and ſay, that it is the language of all Sectaries. This calumny hath been caſt of old upon pure doctrine, *Acts* 24. and their worſhip called *Hereſie* verſe 14. I wiſh that all Sects were ſuch as we are, ſcriptural in their way. Ye are the greateſt Schiſmaticks I know on earth, departing from the Scriptures, and mocking others who adhere to them. The other aſſertion is, *That this is the voice of common people, who claim deſcent from Adam and Eve*. Is not this true? Are not all nations of men made of one blood, *Acts* 17. 26.

It

It is grace and vertue which maketh the difference, *Omnis sanguis concolor*. And if we have as much relation to scripture Churches, as multitudes have to *Adam* and *Eve*, we are not spurious but of a right extract. Ye probably must be a kind of men like the pre-Adamits, and of another descent, But one cheat is here remarkable, you promise to shew how contrar our doctrine is to scripture, and when you come to answer, then you beginne with *Dudithius*, and overleap the whole scripture. Your own *Rainerius* an Inquisitor, giveth this verdict concerning us, that we are said to have been from the beginning, and walked by the Scriptures. Secondly, You pass that concerning professours of our doctrine in all Ages, and will not signifie one man who answereth *Flaccius* or refuteth *Usher*, but only you averre with *Dr. Vane*, to whom ye are much beholden in this, *that they were not in all things ours*. I know few discerning men who agree in all things. If we hold one foundation which Jesus Christ hath laid, that maketh unity and uniformity. All Christian Churches, except Romanists, make the Scripture the sole rule of their faith, and to this we accord. Were the Eastern and Western Churches essentially different, because of some discrepances about the time of *Easter*, &c. For *Turkes*

and *Tartars* they are without Christ, and you might more pertinently have spared the comparison of them with ancient churches and professours; if your charity were as much in your breasts, as in your books, and your respect real to the Saints in light. Thirdly, That which I said I will make good, that all the positive fundamentals of our Religion were maintained in the Church the first 400. years. This appeareth from the *Creeds*, and *Confessions of Faith* then made, yet extant. Let any read the *Apostolick*, *Nicene*, or *Anathasius Creed*, the determinations of the *Ephesian* council written by *Cyril of Alexandria*, the *Confession of Faith* made by the council of *Chalcedon*, and there they will find exact conformity with the positives of our Religion. Popery addeth to these their own inventions, which we renounce, and this maketh the difference. To make this truth appear the more, I shal name these foundations. The doctrine of the *Prophets* and *Apostles*, upon which our faith is builded. We hold that there is one GOD, & three Persons, that the world was made by GOD, and man the tennant, when the house was made, appointed to bring in his rent. That man was made according to the Image of GOD, in holiness, and righteousness. That he fell from his first state, and turned to the

creature

creature by transgression. That sin entered thus, and death by sin. That he sinned as a publick person, and involved posterity under a curse. That GOD so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, who was very GOD, made flesh in the womb of the blessed Virgin; and dyed for our sins, and after burial, rose again for our righteousness. So that it is the blood of Jesus Christ only that cleanseth us from all sin. And eternal life is the gift of GOD through Jesus Christ our Lord: and when he paid the price then he ascended to Heaven, and the Heaven must contain him as man, till the day of the restitution of all things. That he is now at the right hand of GOD, advocating and interceeding for as many as the Father gave him, and shal come again and render to every man according to his works. When he ascended on high, he led captivity captive, and sent the Holy Ghost who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, who createth faith in us, by which we are justified. Who enlightneth, convinceth, comforteth, supporteth, directeth all the houshold of faith, and teacheth all the children to worship God alone, in spirit and in truth, and to call on his Name, through Jesus Christ the only Mediatour betwixt GOD and man. Our Lord sent his Apostles, and set them in the

church

Church commanding them to teach and baptize all Nations. To ordain Paſtours for edifying the body, whoſe power and calling it is to preach the Word purely, to adminiſtrat the Sacraments of Baptiſm and the Supper of the Lord as it was firſt deliveted, to rule their flocks as they that watch for ſouls, and ſhould ſtand and feed in the ſtrength of the Lord, to adminiſter diſcipline according to the word of GOD, and to do every thing commanded there, which may bring men near GOD, and help them forward in their journey to Heaven. That Magiſtrats ſhould be obeyed in the Lord. Parents honoured, and husband and wife dwel together according to knowledge, as heirs of the grace of life. That Maſters ſhould remember they have a Maſter in Heaven, and Servants be ſubject to their Maſters for the Lords ſake. That the Lord to whom we owe all, ſhould be loved with the whole heart, and have the flower of our affection, and that we love our neighbour as our ſelf. That we ſhould rather ſuffer, then ſin, and glorify GOD in every ſtation wherein he placeth us. This is the ſumme of the poſitives which we maintaine, & he who will deny, that all this is contained in Scripture, and conſented to by the Fathers, hath no underſtanding either of Scripture or antiquity. The negatives of

our

our Religion are points of Popery denyed by us, and condemned in the Scripture, contrar to all antiquity. Such as these. That the Pope of Rome is supream infallible Monarch of the Christian Church. That he, and these who follow him cannot erre in matters of faith. That he hath preheminence above the scripture, and may dispence with the law of GOD, concerning incest, murder, perjury &c. That he may depose Kings. Their service in an unknown tongue, is contrary toall pure antiquitity, so much is confessed by *Thomas Cajetan*, and *Lyranus* writting on 1. *Cor.* 14. Their praying on beads a late invention, *Polid. Virgil. lib.* 5. *invent. cap.* 9. Their carrying of the Hoste by a pompous procession is *praeter veterem morem*, saith *Cassander consult. art.* 22. not according to antiquity: That Christ is bodily present there, and should be worshipped, and that bread and wine is no longer there after consecration, is not older then the *Lateran Council*. That the cup should be holden from the People, is of one age with the council of *Constance*. That the *Mass* is a proper propitiatory sacrifice for the sinnes of dead and living, was unknown to *Peter Lombard*, who saith from *Augustin lib.* 4. *disp. 12. that which is offered, is called a sacrifice, because it is a commemoration and representation of the true sacrifice made*

on

in the altar of the Cross, *Augustin lib. 20. cap. 21. against Faustus the Manichean, the flesh and blood of Christ before his comming into the world, was promised by the similitude of the legall sacrifices; in the suffering of Christ himself, his flesh and blood was in the veritie, and all maner of type it self exhibited; after the Ascension of Christ, it is celebrated in the Sacrament of commemoration.* That none should communicate, except such as make auricular confession to a Priest, was not known in the ancient Church, saith *Maldon. sum. qu. 2. art. 11.* Where there was only publick confession. That Images should be set up in Churches and worshipped, was abominated in the second council of *Nice*. The like may be said of Purgatorie, worshipping Saints and Angels, with-holding the Bible from people, &c. So the Romish Religion is new, and our the good old way, *quod primum verum*, saith *Tertul. lib. 4. contra Marcion. cap. 5.* It is true that the enemy did sow tares quickly in the Church, and the mysterie of iniquity did encrease by degrees; Yet these were not holden to be *de fide*, and made articles of the Christian Creed, under the paine of Anathema, till the council of *Trent*, when indeed in stead of reformation, which occasioned that convention, the *Trent* Doctors, or at least the plurality of them gathered

the

the *crotchets* of some Fathers, the disputable opinions of some School-men, and making a bundle of all together, did obtrude them to be believed by all Christians, under the pain of excommunication. So that the church of Rome as new dogmatized, is no older then the council of *Trent*, and ours is as old as Scripture, sensed by the purest antiquity. For further clearing, beside all I have said formerly, you may hear this more, how *Suarez* telleth us, that the council of *Florence* did at first insinuat, that there were seven *Sacraments*, but it was no article of faith till the council of *Trent*, the like may be said of the rest. So Popery is a superstitious superstructure, like an ulcer on the body, which was long in growing, at last did break out, and stain the garments of many in a world. When our Lord Jesus dyed, he left a Testamen behind him, which being opened, directeth all his subjects how to carry. Papists not content with this rule for ordering his legacie, upon a pompous design have formed a dative, which they make equal to his Testament, which we disclaim, and honestly adhere to the first Testament, here is the rule of our Negatives.

It is unreasonick bragge, for you to say, *That of an 100. Fathers ye have 99. for your tenets*, and as untrue that *the four first gene-*

ral Councils were for the Popes universal supremacie. The Fathers though the mystery of iniquitie was then in the cradle, being taken up with other controversies, did not purposely fall on these tares, which scarcely were come to the blade then. For instance, the Fathers in the first 300. years whose books are extar, were *Iust. Mar.* who did writ 150. year after Christ, an Apology for the vindication of Christians to the *Senat of Rome*, after another of the same kind to *Antonius* the Emperor, a Dialogue concerning the verity of Christian Religion, called *Tryphon*, and some other letters exhorting to moral duties, holding forth the Religion of Christians against Jews and Gentiles, but that which is Poperie, the source of controversies in the Christian Church was unknown to him. The next is *Irenaus*, who lived about the year of Christ 178. He did write five books against the heresies of his time, as the *Valentinians*, *Gnosticks*, *Ophites*, the heresie of *Simon Magus*, *Menander*, *Basilides*. So Popery is not to be found in them, unless some of these heresies be found in their skirts. The third is *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who flourished in the year of Christ 196. who was a *Presbyter* of *Alexandria*, the subject he handleth is in three parcels, an exhortation to the Gentiles to renounce their Idols, a Pædagogy to the Christians, instruct-

ing

ing them about their carriage, and his *Stromata* which is a Miſcellany work againſt the followers of *Baſilides*, *Gnoſticks*, &c. *Origen* lived about the ſame time, whoſe writtings are ſo imperfect and vitiated, that we ſcarce know what to make of them, as *Eraſmus* witneſſeth in his edition. *Tertullian* did writ about the ſame time ſeveral books, as concerning *Patience*, *the Reſurrection*, *againſt the Jews*, againſt *Marcion*, *Hermogenes*, *Praxeas*, the defence of Chriſtians againſt Idolatry, &c. The Martyr *Cyprian* who lived *anno* 258. writteth ſome epiſtles, treatiſes and ſermons about the caſes of his time. *Lactantius* and *Arnobius* flouriſhed in the beginning of the *fourth Centurie*, and did writ againſt the *Gentiles*, but the Popiſh traſh was unknown to them. So it is not ſtrange albeit the Negatives of our Religion were not handled directly by the Fathers, ſeeing then the Popiſh controverſies were not ſtarted, however the *Jeſuits* do wreſt ſome ſayings of theſe Fathers for their own ends, yet an attentive Reader will find that they make not for them, as *Scultetus* and *Dr. Forbes*, *Dr. Uſher*, and *Dr. Morton* have ſufficiently proved. In the following ages they had to do with *Arrius*, *Macedonius*, *Neſtorius*, *Eutiches*, but Popery then was under the hatches, and the decrees of the

Trent Council wholly unknown.

Further, controversies betwixt us and Papists, can hardly be decided by the Fathers, for some of them made retractations, others held forth the opinion of others frequently, then what they propose sometime, is esteemed by them probable, not certain; and all of them Printed since the *Trent* council, have been castrated by the Popish *Index expurgatorius*. Therefore they cannot be thought the fittest Umpyres in our present debates; neither are they made judges, either by the Popish partie or ours: for they appeal to the Pope, we to the Scriptures, and do make use of them as Commentators, and historians only. Further, the Fathers desire us to look on them, only as such. I shal cite three testimonies proving this to the full, One is that of *Augustin, in his epist. to Hieron, concerning the interpretation of the 2. chap. to the Galatians.* When he is pressed with the testimonie of old authours, *Ego didici, hunc honorē deferre tantū Scripturarum libris qui Canonici appellantur, ut nullum eorum authorum in scribendo aliquid errasse, firmiter credam, nec arbitror, mi frater, te velle tuos libros sic legi, tanquam Prophetarum & Apostolorum.* i. e. *I have learned to give that honour only to the books of Scripture, which are canonick, that their authours, have not erred.* And a little thereafter

thereafter. *I do not think my brother that you would have your books ſo read as the books of the Prophets and Apoſtles.*

The ſecond teſtimony is in his thirtd *Epiſtle* to *Fortunatus*, *Nec quorumlibet diſputationes, tanquam Scripturas Canonicas, habere debemus, ut non liceat, ſalva honorificentia qua iis debetur, aliquid in eorum ſcriptis improbare, ſi forte aliter ſenſerint, quam veritas habet, talis ego ſum in ſcriptis aliorum, tales volo eſſe lectores meorum. i. e.* We ought not to look on the writtings of men, as the Scriptures of GOD, but may diſprove that which is not truth in their books, if they have not ſet down the truth, ſuch I am in the writtings of others, ſuch I deſire to be the readers of my own.

The third teſtimony is that of *Hieron, lib. 2. contra Ruffinum*, where ſpeaking of *Origen* and other Fathers, he ſaith, *fieri poteſt, ut ſimpliciter errarint, vel alio ſenſu ſcripſerint, vel à librariis imperitis eorum ſcripta paulatim corrupta ſunt, vel antequam Arrius natus ſit, minus caute loquuti ſint.* i. e. It may be they have erred and ſpoken in another ſenſe, or their books have been corrupted, or before *Arrius* they have not ſpoken ſo warily on the point. If then we hold Fathers in their own room according to their deſire, no wrong is done to them.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, That none think we diffide the Fathers or Councils, it will be found that pure antiquity favoureth us more then Popery. This you deny, and cites for you *Beza his epist. ad Dudithium*, whereby your studied endeavour to deceive people, may appear, for *Beza* there is only answering an objection brought in amongst others by *Dudithius*, for resolution, that he might be confirmed in the faith by him. Wherein *Beza* doth judiciously give resolution. Will it then follow that *Dudithius* was of this opinion? So deal you with *Martyr* and *Chemnitius* who assert no such thing. It is known both of them were good Antiquaries, and confirm our tenets by several testimonies of Ancients. It is like you have taken these citations from your *Index*, and not from the *Authours*. Neither *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Whitgift*, *Fulke*, or any reformed Divine hold from Fathers or Councils their due. Yea, we reverence them more then ye do.

You bring the four Councils for the Popes universal supremacie and infallibility. If this be not it which you intend to prove, your answer meeteth not mine. This is a negative of our Religion, was it heard of the first 300 years? You say not so. But in the next 300. years was the Popes universal supremacie or infallibility heard of? This you allege

leage, and by providence contradict your self, it is known that in the Council of *Nice* no mention is made of an universal, far less infallible Pope. You cite the 29. Canon of the *Nican* Council, whereas there were but 22. of them in whole, saith *Ruffinus*, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 6. Their sixth Canon is far from that. If that had been in their Creed they needed no Council, the Pope in *Cathedra* would have done all. And in the council of *Constantinople* they establish the power of their own Patriarch. Why then say you that he was established there universal infallible Monarch of the whole Church? Will ye remember better your connexions? Was he *Peters* successour according to the council of *Ephesus*? Then no universal Monarch. *He was a Presbyter, an Elder, not a Lord over GODS heritage*, see 1. *Peter*, 5. 3. Thirdly, Expone this, and reconcile it with the Popedom, if you can? Was he Patriarch of old Rome? Then no universal head, these two seem to clash, and the council wordeth it better. But why do you not mention his infallibility in your Reply; It is the key of Popery, and let you it thus slip out amongst your hands? Not one Father or primitive Council is cited for this. The Council of *Chalcedon* saith expresly, that the Pope of Rome hath no priviledge from

Christ

Christ, above others; but only because it was the seat of the Roman Empire, *Act.* 15. you will not then have the four Councils for you, except you coine some new acts as the 29. of *Nice*. By which also it may appear how groundless, and vain your boasting is of having 90. Fathers of an 100. for this point. The opposition of the Ancients thereto is clearly demonstrated by learned *Morton* in his *Grand Impostor*.

Here that you seem not to be silent, you bring forth impertinently these texts of Scripture formerly explained, *Tell the Church, &c.* To which I referre the Reader for satisfaction: there be no more priviledge there concerning the Church of Rome, then the Church of SCOTLAND, and not so much as it is now constituted and adulterated. We do believe an universal Church, but it is far from our thoughts that Rome is it. We allow Ministerial helps for expounding Scripture, but do not renounce the judgement of discretion in Christians. And concerning interpretation of Scripture, infallibility of Pope or Council, and the priviledges of the universal Church, enough is formerly mentioned. And these your so often repeated cavils are abundantly refuted, and what you say, you did in your Reply to my first Answer, is refuted by me in my Duply thereto

For

For this is *Crambe recocta.*

Lastly, You cite some Fathers of the first 3. ages against our negatives, and would hold us in hand that they maintained them as Articles of their Creed. But ye cite spurious Authours, as *Origens, Threni*, or *Lamen: Cyprian de Cœna, St. Andrew, St. Dennis &c.* some of which your own writters call in question, see *Bellarmin de Script. Eccl. pag.* 83. & *de Euchar. lib.* 2. *cap.* 9. *Iustin Martyr* † is brought for transubstantiation, which is a manifest untruth: For the words of *Iustin Martyr* are these, [illegible] &c. i. e. *That sanctified Food, wherewith our blood and flesh by conversion is nourished, is that, which we are taught to be the Body and Blood of Christ.* If it be food, wherewith our blood and flesh is nourished, then where is your Transubstantiation? There it is bread in substance, and the Body of Christ in signification and Sacramental relation. If you please, by this you may be convinced of your errour, ignorance, and boldness. It is as untrue that *Cyprian* said or meaned so, except in a Sacramental sense, for in his 63. *epist.* he saith, *Invenimus Vinum fuisse quod Sanguinem suum dixit*, i. e. *We find that it was the wine which he called his blood*, and in his 76. *epist.* he saith, *quando dominus appel-*

† *In his Apology to Antonius the Emperour.*

lat panem, corpus suum, & vinum sanguinem, populum nostrum quem portabat indicat adunatum. i. e. When our Lord calleth the bread his Body, and the wine his Blood, he signifyeth that we being many are one lump of bread.

As for the proof of the *Mass* from *S. Andrew*, I can find no such book, and amongst all the Ecclesiastick writters in the first 300. years there was no mention made of him. If he making for your behove could be produced as an Author, it is strange how *Bellarm.* hath forgotten to name him. So I cannot take this authour off your hand. But this is sure, *Eusebius lib. 8. Dem. Evang. in fine* calleth the Bread [illegible] *the memorial of his Body, the Image of his Body.* Then it is no sacrifice, nor corporally the Body. And seeing it is really, relatively, and symbolically such, we would not have it now abused by negligence, *Origen* saith no more *hom. 13. on Exod.* we say no less.

For *Purgatory*, you cite *Tertullian* in the second Age, and *Cyprian* in the third, neither of which were for it: For *Tertull. lib. de Patien.* saith, *Christum ladimus, cum vocatos quosdam, ab eo quasi miserandos, non aequanimiter accipimus.* As if they who are called hence, and be with Christ, were in a pityful

state

ſtate, having obtained their deſire, *Phil.* 1. 23. and *Cyprian de immortalitate*, ſaith, *Ad refrigerium juſti vocantur, ad ſupplicium injuſti capiuntur, velocius tutela fidentibus, perfidis pœna.* i. e. *The juſt are called to refreſhing reſt, the wicked are taken to puniſhment: ſafety cometh very ſwiftly to Believers, and puniſhment to unbelievers.* And *Cyprian* ſaith, *lib. adverſus Demetrianum, Ævi temporalis fine completo ad æternæ, vel mortis vel immortalitatis hoſpitia, divdimur. Et ibidem. Quando illinc exceſſum fuerit, nullus jam locus pœnitentiæ eſt, nullus ſatisfactionis effectus, ad mortalitatem ſub ipſa morte tranſitur.* i. e. *When men depart out of this world, there is no place thereafter for repentance, no effect of ſatisfaction, at death men paſs over to immortality.* It is true, they grant Probatory afflictions, and the fiery tryal here. Some of them alſo deny full fruition to the Elect, till the day of judgement: But for Purgatory till the ſixth Age it was not known; then *Gregory* the firſt mantained it, *Dial. lib.* 4. *cap.* 39. Neither can that priſon *Matth.* 5. be underſtood of Purgatory, as ſhal be afterwards proved. I ſhal cloſe this point with *Iuſtin Martyr reſp. ad Orthod. queſt. pag.* 75. μετα δε τον εκ τοῦ σωματος ἐξοδον, εὐθεως γινεται τῶν δικαιων κἰ ἀδικων η διαστολη. i.e. *After the departure of the Soul out of the Body, immediatly,*

dially there is a separation of the just from the unjust: for the souls of the righteous are brought to Paradise, and the souls of the wicked are taken to hell.

Then you prove *Prayer to the dead*, from *Clemens epist. 1. de Sancto Petro*, and *Tertul. de cor. mil.* I shal not insist on that Apocryphal Epistle, but for *Tertullian*, he and others prayed for a joyful Resurrection to them. And hence are some Panegyricks concerning them, which were rather to profit themselves then the party deceased, as *Augustin* telleth us in *Enchir: ad Laurentium*, they were *Consolationes vivorum*. You offer also to make out by *Sr. Dennis* that they *in primæ primitiva Ecclesia*, prayed to Saints and Angels. As for the first citation, to you who professe to believe the Scriptures of GOD, and do yet stumble weak ones with thornie questions concerning their authority; it will not be unexpedient for me who cannot find such a writter in the second Centurie, (for you cannot mean *Dionysius the Areopagit* who lived in the 1. Centurie, nor *Dionysius Alexandrinus*, who lived in the 3. Centurie.) To enquire I say of you, whither was there such a Saint? And if that be made out whither did he writ any book at all? And if so, if this be the book which you call his? I will not take the Popes word for it nor yours, seeing

ing both *Hieron* and *Bellarmin* leave him out of their history. When these questions are answered, I shal prepare an answer for his testimony. But it is more strange that you cite *Origen* who writting against the Pagan *Celsus*, in this point of prayer to Saints and Angels, *lib.* 8. *pag.* 432. 433. saith expressly, *to whom we give the first fruits to him we send our prayers to the great high Priest, Jesus the Son of GOD, who is entered into Heaven.* This is like your testimonie from *Dudithius*, if that be *Origen* you cite for *Origens*, *Threni*, or *Lament*: to be spurious, some judicious do averre, as *Erasmus* so *Barronius*, *tom.* 2. *ad annum.* 253. here is a retractation. Your own *Salmeron* telleth us to more purpose, the reason why in the primitive times there was no invocation of Saints and Angels, *Quia occasio daretur gentibus, putandi sibi exhibitos multos Deos, pro multitudine devorum. disp.* 8. *in* 1. *Tim.* 2.

As for the sign of the Crose, it is true *Tertullian* is for it in these places named, and it was in use amongst Christians when they had to do with Pagans, and some who are not of your communion make use of it as yet; others think that seeing the occasion of the first making use of it is removed, it not being commanded in Scripture, and much abused

buſed by you, that it is more expedient to leave it undone: But your abuſe of it is not approved by *Tertullian*, ſo his teſtimony maketh nothing for you who do ſo. And for Images, it is an impudencie in you to ſay, that there were any Images ſet up in Churches the firſt 300. years, what ever draughts might be in dwelling houſes, or cups. For proving your ſhameleſneſs in this aſſertion, hear your own *Lorinus on* 17. *Acts on the* 15. *verſe &c.* where, with *Vaſquez* and *Durand*, he telleth, *that all Images were forbidden under the Law*, and citeth for it *Ex.*20. 3. then he ſheweth *that under the Goſpel in the firſt Centuries there were no Images*, for this he citeth *Lactantius* and *Tertullian*, *Auguſtin*, and *Arnobius contra Gentes*, who ſaith that *Gentiles, exprobrabant Chriſtianis quod nullam Dei formarent picturam, occultabant quod colebant* i. e. *The Gentiles did upbraid the Chriſtians becauſe they would not make any Image of GOD, they did hide what they worſhipped. That Adrian fancying the Chriſtians as Pagans ſuſpected, did build his Temple without any Images. And in Conſtantins his time, the Chriſtian Chappels were called Temples Adriani.* Then he bringeth the decree of the *Council of Eliberis*, where it was provided *that there ſhould be no Images in Churches. Ne quod colitur & adoratur in parietibus depingatur*

depingatur. i. e. *that which is worshipped and adored should not be painted on walls.* This council was celebrated in the time of *Constantine* in the fourth Centurie, and this is the 36. *Canon* of it. And till the second *Council of Nice*, which was in the 800. year, Image worship was abominable in the Christian Church. How then can you assert so great and absurd an untruth? Read ancient History and acknowledge your errour. As for *Free-will*, we do not deny it in some sense, and in the *Jesuited* sense, none of these you cite did maintaine it. *Augustin* against *Julian*, and *Pelagius* opposed that, so do we. This is well proved by *Jansenius Yprensis* in his defence of *Augustins* doctrine against the *Jesuits*. *Vincentius Lyrinensis adversus Hæreses, lib.* 1. *cap.* 34. proveth that *Pelagius* was the first inventer of your *Free-will*, which is *Arbitrium servum*. As for the *merit of works*, *Justin Martyr* understood not by it *meritum condigni*, but the obtaining of the end of their faith and labours. So *Augustin*, saith the Apostle *Paul*, *electionis vas meruit nominari*, *lib. de præd. & gratia*, and *Cyprian* readeth that 1. *Tim.* 1. 13. *I obtained mercy*, *misericordiam merui*. You keep the words which some ancients used, and we the sense, so ye deceive the People. In your sense they absolutly renounced

renounced it. *Origen in epist. ad Rom. lib. 4. saith, Vix mihi suadeo, quod possit ullum opus esse a nobis, quod ex debito remuneratione Dei poscat.* i. e. *I can hardly perswade my self that there can be any work, which of debt deserveth a reward from GOD. Bernard in Cant serm. 67. unusquisque in quo gratia intret, ubi jam meritum occupavit.* i. e. *Grace hath no place to enter where merit hath occupied the room.* Your own *Ferus on Matth. chap. 20. 8.* saith, *GOD hath freely promised (he rendereth freely) if therefore thou wouldest keep the grace and favour of GOD, make no mention of thine own merits. For out of mercy he will give all, yet thou must not be the slower to good works, yea we should be more fervent, for doing of them, as becometh us well, who have so bountiful a Lord.* Which words the *Spanish* inquisitors would have expunged.

Lastly, You prove the *fulfiling of the law*, even as the rest, by *Tertullian* and *Origen*, who say nothing but that through Christ, who strengtheneth us we can do all things. This is the word of GOD *Phil. 4. 13.* which we will not disclaim. But the man who can fulfil the Covenant of works, needeth not a Saviour. Is it like they would hold it in your sense, seeing they disclaime merit, and said with us, *In many things we offend all, and when we have done all we are unprofitable servants*

ſervants. Where is perfection then? The law may be ſo farre fulfilled as to make us acceptable to GOD through Chriſt, but not to juſtifie us. Now let the Reader judge impartially, whither it was ignorance in me, to ſay, that the primitive Church knew not Popery, and that the negatives of our Religion could not be allowed by them, more then by us. What they ſay *obiter*, concerning any thing of that kind, is for us more then for Papiſts.

Papiſts Queſt: 8.

Queſtion eight. *How prove you the tenets of the Church of Rome to be contrar to Scripture?*

Anſwer, Your doctrine forbidding Laicks, (as ye call them) *to read and ſearch the word of GOD*, is againſt the command of Chriſt, *John* 5. 39. this is written Scripture, which ye contradict by your practice. &c.

Proteſtants Anſwer.

Reply, *In your eight Anſwer, you are ſo confuſed in your method, ſo weak in your citations, and even ſometimes ſo contradicting to your ſelf, that it needeth no other cenſure. Yet I will reflect briefely on every thing. You object firſt our doctrine, forbidding Laicks as we call them, ſay you, (as if there were no true diſtinction between Church men and Laicks: i. e. a Miniſter and a Cobler in Eccleſiaſtical functions.) To read the Scripture is againſt the command of Chriſt. Where firſt you object, as if there were any article of the Catholick*

Papiſts Reply.

Church, forbidding them to read Scripture absolutly. She forbiddeth them to read Scripture without leave of their Pastours and Directours, which is easily granted to any judicious person, as all the Converts of this Countrey know, whereof the greatest part have seen your errours in Scripture, and detasted them. Your citation is weak, and can prove nothing till it be made out, whither the words be imperatively taken, or rather indicatively. Ye search the Scriptures, so Cyril interpreteth it lib. 3. in Iohn chap. 4. To whom Beza assenteth, advertising that the word should be rather taken in the indicative mood. So that you see I must have some other infallible judge, to tell me in which of these two senses it should be taken, before I build any thing on this place. Thirdly, As Christ in the same chapter proveth himself to be the Son of GOD by four testimonies. First, Of John the Baptist. Secondly, Of his works and miracles. Thirdly, Of his Heavenly Father. Fourthly, Of Scripture. So do we prove by four like testimonies the Roman Church. First, By the authority of the Fathers. Secondly, By miracles in all ages. Thirdly, By the authority of GOD clearly saying in all ages, by her unitie, sanctity, infallibility, This is my Spouse. Fourthly, Of Scriptures, exhorting all to read and hear them, not superficially, turning and shuffling them

them over as the Jews do to this day, and yet obstinatly deny what they so clearly testifie, but to consider and reflect on the Catholick verities there delivered, as, that Christ was truely the Son of GOD.

Answer, If my Answer be weak it is the more easily refuted. But how can a Scripture argument be weak, except it be misapplied, which you do not alleage here? I had almost forgotten the reason, which is this, that all Scripture is like *Æsops fables* to you, unless it be sensed and animated by your Church. *Hinc illæ lachryma.* Then you say I am confused in the method. I beginne with the Scripture, then I go to the worship, &c. Is there any thing jumbled here? I know no rule tendered by *Methodists* for sorting Scripture citations, if they be pertinently cited. And whither you speak truth in fathering contradictions upon me, it will afterward appear when I consider your answers to these 20. texts of Scripture, and compare them with your former Replyes; it putteth me in mind of our Sea fouls, which can flee only above water, and flutter on the sand. So you mount up with humane traditions, but can scarcely flutter when you mention Scripture, it is not your Element, this appeareth by your first Reply, and the rest are no better. For once you deny that

Protestants Answer.

the people (I said you call them Laicks, not that we deny a distinction betwixt Pastours and people as you would insinuat. But to note your vaine appropriating the name of Clergie, or the Lords heritage, to your Priests, as if the people of GOD were not a part thereof, contrary to 1. *Pet.* 5. 3. and as if you had a cōmanding power over them. For the arrogancy of your Roman Clergie, *Jerome* called them *Senatum Pharisaorum*, the Senate of the Pharisees.) I say the people are forbidden to read the Scripture by you. And that some in SCOTLAND of your way are licensed to read them, if this were true, why is it a ground of inquisition abroad to have a Bible by them, and made a ground of persecution here in the time of reformation, if there be no countermand, why is it held a transgression?

2. Secondly, The granting of a licence to some, implyeth an inhibition, and ye are witty in licensing some sew to read it here, and none in *Italy* or *Spain*. For there be no hazard to the Popedom here, which might be there, if they were not so muzled. Next you say the word *John* 5. 39. is not in the *imperative* but *indicative mood*, for that you cite *Cyril* and *Beza*. Giving, not granting that it is so, it maketh still against your practise: For they searched the Scriptures with his approbation

approbation, and our Lord referreth the people to them, as the rule of their direction for knowing him, which ye refuse to do, for ye must have another infallible judge to bear testimonie of him.

Thirdly, You desire people not to shuffle, but search the Scriptures. I am glad to hear you speak so; you yeeld the cause, we seek no more. Blessed be the Lord GOD of truth, *Magna est vis veritatis*, and blessed is the man who meditate in the Law of GOD day and night. For your application of the place it is selfish, and the similitude halteth on more legge then one. 3.

The second Scripture is that 1. *Cor.* 14. 14. which forbiddeth your *Latine service. If I pray in an unknown tongue, my understanding is unfruitful, &c. How shal one who occupieth the room of the unlearned say amen? verse* 16. *Prote-stants 2. Inst. § 2.*

Reply, *You reply that the word* unknown *is not in the Original, but taken in by interpreters, neither is it great inconvenient, albeit men pray publickly in an unknown tongue, sith ence preaching only is for edification, and information of the judgment, not prayer. Is there any scripture forbidding us to pray, except the understanding of the hearers be instructed? The high Priest amongst the Jews prayed in the sanctuary, and was seperated from the people, therefore could not influence their* *Papists Reply.*

their understanding, yet that was their forme of publick worship; And the Apostle in the same chapter, verse 5. To speak with tongues I forbid not, I wish ye did all speak with tongues, *and he desireth them* to pray that they might interpret. *And the Liturgies of the Church are interpreted to the people. This scripture maketh more against your Ministers, who with extemporarie prayers, speak non-sense, which hath made one of your own Poets say, fools understand not us, nor wise men you.*

Protestants Answer

Answer, You have need to understand the Greek tongue better, that there be a difference betwixt γλῶσσα and διαλεκτος. γλῶσσα is an *unknown tongue*, and when the Apostle saith γλῶσσα λαλων, it needed no other word for that comprehendeth *barbarous Language*, as διαλεκτος doth the *known tongue*. Further, he desireth them to pray that they might interpret; *Ergo*, it was an *unknown tongue*. *Varro lib. 6. de lingua latina*, when he citeth *Aristotles* book, intituled *Absolet names*, calleth them *Glossa Aristotelis*, any may see more of this in that learned Critick *Mansacius* † in *Harpocrationem*. If you will read the 3. verse, the equivalent of it is in the original, for he mentioneth, speaking in a tongue not understood, and is not that an unknown tongue? Then it is in a tongue to which the unlearned could

† *Mansacius in Harpocrationem.* pa. 352.

could not ſay *Amen* when one bleſſed or gave thanks. Thus verſe 16. and it is the purpoſe of the Holy Ghoſt, to refute that unedifying way at length by ſundry arguments. Amongſt which this is one, that the underſtanding was thereby rendered unfruitful. Therefore, the Apoſtle reſolveth *to pray with the ſpirit and the underſtanding alſo, verſe* 15. You abſurdly contradict the Apoſtle by your practiſe, and adde in termes, that it is no great inconvenient, *albeit the underſtanding be unfruitful.* He ſaith it is one. You deny it. Whither ſhal I believe the Apoſtle *Paul* or you? I am aſhamed of your impudencie herein. How dare you *Palam & in os*, contradict the Scripture? Your ragged reaſons ſubjoyned, *Becauſe prayer is not ſo much for the underſtanding, as Preaching and Catechiſing: Is there any ſcripture ſay you not to pray, except they inſtruct the underſtanding of hearers.* I anſwer, the ſcripture is for it *verſe* 15. *I will pray with the ſpirit and the underſtanding alſo.* And if this were not ſo, Parrats might pray, but we ought to ſpeak becauſe we believe. Your other reaſon againſt the Apoſtle is, *That the high Prieſt amongſt the Jews praying in the Sanctuary, was ſeparated from the people, and did not inſtruct their underſtanding, yet that was the forme of their publict worſhip. Yea in the ſame chapter*

verſe

verſe 5. *The Apoſtle ſaith, and to ſpeak with tongues he prohibiteth not.* I anſwer, that the high Prieſt amongſt the Jews, when he was with the people prayed in an known tongue, *Num.* 6. and when he was alone in the moſt holy place, where he entered but once a year, and that not without blood to typifie Jeſus Chriſt, he ſpoke alſo in the vulgar language of the Nation: And was not all their adminiſtrations in Hebrew their mother tongue? How then can you ſay that any of their worſhip was in an unknown tongue? As for that you adde of the 13. verſe, and verſe, 16. it is ſo dark nonſenſe, that to me now ye ſpeak in an unknown tongue, and deſerves no anſwer. He deſireth them to ſpeak with tongues, and interpret them to the unlearned for the uſe of edifying, that all might ſay *Amen.* What can be more clear againſt you?

At laſt you come off this as formerly, and yeeld the cauſe, and ſay, *that the liturgie of the Catholick Church is interpreted to every one, and the greateſt part of the publick prayers tranſlated to the people and ſet down in their own prayer books. And this place of Scripture maketh not againſt us, but Miniſters, who with their extemporarie prayers ſpeak non ſenſe, which hath made one of your own Poets ſay, fools do not underſtand us, nor wiſe men you.*

I am glad to hear that this point which was denyed at the Council of *Trent*, is now granted, and if it be ſo, why jangled you ſo much formerly. But I find it is not ſo, for you are taught to equivocat. And what *your greateſt part* meaneth, is unknown here, it is certain your *Maſſes*, *Aves*, *&c.* are yet muttered and worded in Latine, ye are aſhamed to owne it, not without reaſon. For your reflection on our worſhip we are for reaſonable ſervice, and lively work, to a living GOD, not for none-ſenſe, and would to the Lord your worſhip were as pure as ours is this day, many ſouls might be edified thereby.

Thirdly, *Invocation of Saints and Angels*, is will worſhip, *Col.* 2. 23. *How can we call on him in whom we do not believe*, *Rom.* 10. 14. or lay ſtreſs of belief on a creature? Beſide they know not what we ſay. *Abraham is ignorant of us, and Iſrael acknowledgeth us not, Iſaiah* 63. 16. *Inſt.* 3.

To this your return, is, *that I wreſt the ſcripture* Col. 3. *which ſpeaketh only of the duty of Maſters and Servants, and not one word againſt the worſhip of Saints or Angels. And that place* Rom. 10. 14. *is concerning prayer to GOD only, not about prayer to Saints or Angels. Becauſe we will ſupplicat men on earth in whom we do not believe. And the* *Papiſts Reply.*

text Isaiah 63. 16. *cited by you is meaned of the knowledge of approbation, as* Hierom *interpreteth the place. According to which it will rather follow, that they did know what passed here below, and disowned a degenerated multitude.*

Protestants Duply.

Answer, I confess if I had cited that place which you mention upon this subject, I had not only wrested but martyred Scripture. You may believe it never entered into my mind to do so. The place I cited was the 2. chapter of the *Colossians*, verse 23. where *worshipping of Angels* is termed *will worship*. And what can you say to that? I would suspect that you purposely have omitted this scripture, yet this might as easily be refuted by you, as 1. *Cor.* 14. For he who said the one, said also the other. The 10. *Rom.* 14. you labour to interpret thus, *that it is meaned of prayer to GOD, not of calling on men or Angels: because we will call on men on earth in whom we do not believe.* The words are general, and the interrogative is equivalent to a negative. *None can call on them in whom they do not believe.* You say *we call on men on earth.* What do we pray to men? The calling here, is a part of religious worship, which cannot be given to the greatest Potentat in the World. Then you tell that the 63 *of Isaiah, is meaned of a knowledge of approbation*

approbation, like that, depart from me I know you not, id. est. *I approve you not, so Hierom expoundeth the text, and according to this expositon, it will rather follow that they did know what passed here below, and disowned a degenerated multitude.* I answere that exposition of *Is.* 63. is contrare to the stream of Interpreters. Yea to the connexion of the words. For it is a prayer put up to God, and the sense seemeth to be this, Thou O Lord knowest how to helpe us, although *Abraham* knoweth not what is become of us. So it is an opposition between divine knowledge, and that of *Abraham*; *Doubtless thou art our father*, &c. But supposing *Hierom* interpretation to be true, it will not follow that they knew what was done on earth, but only this, that if Israel were on earth, they were so farre degenerated that he would not know his posteritie. I'le close this with the testimony of your own *Eckius in his Enchir. ch.* 15. *there is no warrand for invocation of Saints or Angels from the scripture, and that the Apostles either by word or writ left any thing behind them to be done &c.* He might have said more, there be warrand for the contrar.

Fourthly, Your *worshipping of Images*, is an expresse breach of the second Command, which forbiddeth any sort of worship to any *Inst.* 4.

Image in Heaven or in Earth, *Ex.* 20. 4. And ye Papists being conscious of your guilt herein, have thievously stoln out the second Command, and divided the tenth into two branches, witness *Bellarmins* Catechism, and your other writters.

Papists Reply.

To this you answer, That the division of the Commands is not in scripture, so we cannot know the second or third. How then standing by scripture your only determiner shall we judge of this? And if you come to authority or reason, I appeal to your self whither it be Idolatrie to worship Images? Seeing all Idolatrie is against the first Command. It being the worship of a creature in the place of GOD. Therefore Bellarmin and others take what ye call the second Command, for a further explanation of the first, and so set down, but the substantial words, Thou shalt have no other Gods but me. *Yet take not the rest out of the Bible, which is there set down at length. But Protestants take away all the Commandments, saying, it is impossible to keep them. For there is no Command where there is no obligation of keeping, and* Nemo tenetur ad impossibile. *Then reason misketh for diviaing the tenth Commandment in two. For as theft and adulterie are forbidden by two Commands: so the inward desire of the heart after a mans wife and goods, should likewise in reason be rather*

forbidden

forbidden by two Commandments, then Idolatrie alone by two. But if making of Images, kneeling before them or worshipping them, not as Gods, but as things which keep us in mind of GOD, and his Saints, as the seventh general Council saith, us the holie books; Why did GOD make man to his own Image, and oblidge us to honour him as his Image? Why did he put two Cherubs on the Ark before which the Jews kneeled? Why commanded he the Jews to adore the same Ark as his foot-stool: Psalm 98. Why should everie knee bow at the Name of Jesus: For the word being but a sign of the thing signified, is no better then an Image: And why is the place on which the Name of GOD was written, called the place of holy veneration? Exod. 39. 29. Why do we honour the crown, rob royal scepter, and signs of royal authoritie: Why do we call our knights worship? That is a man deserving civil worship, as Saints and holy things do religious. Why do Protestants make their Fathers, Grand-Fathers, and Mistress-Images to keep their memorie, rather then that of Christ and his Saints: Why in end hate they Christs Image, rather then that of Jupiter, or any false God, which they never challenge in any mans house: Or why leave ye whole the Devils Image commonly painted at St. Michaels foot, when they broke the Image of the Arch-Angel?

gel? Who loves the person loves the Image. Judge then whether Protestants *love GOD or the Devil best, their hatred being only against the Image of GOD and Saints, not against these of false Gods and Devils.*

Protestants Answer.

To this your Rhetorication, for it is no Reply, I answere first, That ye misreckon the Commandements, of purpose, that ye may make the second only an appendix of the first, and curtaile it the more easily, because it giveth such check to your superstitious worship; but I will prove from scripture, reason, and antiquitie, that the Commands should be distinguished, as I said, and the second is a command alone. First, It is clear from scripture, that there be ten commandements *Deut* 10. 14. Secondly, it is also clear, that the tenth command, *Thou shalt not covet*, cannot mak up two; because the Apostle *Rom.* 7. v. 7. maketh it but one ουκ επιθυμησεις. Thirdly, if ye will compare *Exod.* 20. 17. with *Deut.* 5. 21. this will also appear true, for in *Exodus* the house is put before the wife. But in *Deut.* it is said first, *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbours wife*, and so these cannot be two preceps, otherwise the Pen-man might be challenged of disorder, for not keeping them distinct. Would he have thus jumbled, two different Commands, who can believe it? Fourthly,

Ye

Ye miſtake the meaning of the tenth Commandment, for it is not the inward deſire of a mans wife by way of adultery, whither deliberat or not which is there intended. That is forbidden in the ſeventh Command. Nor is it the deſire of a man his houſe, or oxe, by way of ſtealing: that is forbidden in the eight Command, but it is a coveting of thoſe by way of propriety, which is equivalent to that, *Heb.* 13. 5. *Let your converſation be without covetouſneſs, and be content with that which ye have.* Now there being but one act *in ſpecie* forbidden that laſt Command ſhould not be parted in two. Fifthly, There be a waſte difference betwixt the ultimate object of worſhip, and the manner of worſhip, which requireth two commands, and make up the firſt and ſecond, one whereof is, *Thou ſhalt have no other Gods.* The other, thou ſhalt worſhip the true and living GOD without Images, and this ſecond Command is explained alone by the Penman in *Deut.* 4. 12. which is not uſual in Scripture, upon a part of a Command. Sixthly, The ancient Fathers generally ſo diſtinguiſhed them, your own *Eſtius* acknowledgeth on the 3. *ſent. diſt.* 36. that *Clemens Alexandrinus, lib.* 6. *ſtrom.* diſtinguiſheth them as we do, and calleth *Thou ſhalt not covet*, the tenth precept *Athanaſius*

ſius de Synopſ. lib. 2. reckoneth them alſo after this manner, the ſecond *Non facies tibi ſimulacrum.* The *Authour of the imperfect work on Matthew*, commonly ſaid to be *Chryſoſt. hom 49.* maketh this the ſecond Command, *Thou ſhalt not make any graven Image*, *Nazian. in Carmin. Ambroſ. on the 6. chapter to the Eph. Philo. on the decalogue. ſo Joſephus in the 3. book of Antiq.* are all for our diviſion. So we have reaſon to divide the precepts thus.

It is clear to any diſcerner ye take with the breach of the ſecond Command: and *Vaſquez* granteth no leſs, *lib. 2. de adorat. diſp. 4 cap. 4. It is true*, ſayeth he, *our practiſe of worſhiping Images, cannot be reconciled, with the ſecond Command, nor with Deut. 4. 12.* but *Illa legis Moſaica prohibitio, fuit juris poſitivi, & ceremonialis, quæ tempore Evangelii, ceſſare debet. Atque id quod alias jure naturali licitum eſt, ut imagines depingere, & illis etiam uti ad adorationem, in lege Evangelica, locum habere debet.* i. e. *That prohibition of the Moſaicall law, was of poſitive and ceremoniall right, which ought to ceaſe in the time of the Goſpel: And that which otherwiſe were lawfull, by natural right, as to paint Images, and alſo to make uſe of them for worſhip, hath place in the Goſpel law alſo.* So ye judge that Command, albeit

one

one of the ten Moral precepts, which *Moſes* calleth ten words, ceremonial, like the eating of Swins fleſh. This is ſhort work. Ye repeal the law becauſe ye will not obey it. Now you ſay, *It is not Idolatrie & that it is ſet down in your Bible, albeit not in your Catechiſm.* Where I obſerve a trick, ye permit not the people generally to read the Bible, it is a ſealed book to them. But becauſe they read the Catechiſms, theſe muſt be caſtrat, leſt that Command ſhould make them deteſt your Idolatrie. You ſay, *It is not Idolatrie, ſeeing ye worſhip not a falſe GOD.* I return, that according to the number of your Cities are your Gods. By the vulgar practiſe, ye have a tutelary Saint for your horſe, ſheep, corn, cattel, &c. Ye pray for Geeſe to Saint *Feriol*, for ſore beaſts to St. *Agatho*, for children to St. *Giles*, to St. *Hubert* for dogs, to St. *Otilia* for the head-ach, to St. *Ruſſia* for madneſs, to St. *Valentine* for the falling-ſickneſs: How then keep ye the firſt Command? Is not he God in whom I truſt, and whom I do worſhip; as appeareth from *Rom.* 10. 14. Further, the worſhipping of God by Images, is expreſly forbidden in the ſecond Command, as the worſhiping of a falſe God, is in the firſt. And if *Aarons* calfe, *Micah* and *Jeroboams* Images, being worſhiped, rendered the tranſgreſſours Idola-

trous, ye are also guilty. For they worshiped the true God, in an Idolatrous, false way. Yea, this was the sin of the Gentiles, when they knew God, thus they changed his Glory. *Rom.* 1. 21. 23. For this it is that *Iohn Mon-ceius*, in his book, entituled, *Aaron Purga-tus*, dedicated to *Pope Paul the* 5. undertaketh to clear *Aaron*, *Micah*, and *Jeroboam*, from the guilt of Idolatry, because they did nothing but what Papists do. *Melchior Ca-nus lib. de traditionibus cap.* 3. acknowledg-eth that the worship of Images is condem-ned in scripture. And *Cassander consult.* 21. confesseth that the adoration of Images was condemned in the Councill of *Frankford*, as, contrare to scripture. So these two heads of my answer that Image-worship is con-trare to the second Command, and that pre-cept stolne from the rest of your Catechism, is proved and granted. We shall now heat what more you will say, in the defence of your Idolatrie, albeit it being far from the first question and answer, deserveth no answer. It is alleadged *we break all the Commandments, because we hold that no fal-len man can perfectly fulfil them.* To this I an-swered formerly, in my return upon the 7. question. But giving and not granting, that this were our errour. Two blacks make not a whit. None of us ever repealed any of the ten

ten Commandments, or refuſed obedience to them: only we ſay, it is not perfect obedience, as was required under the Covenant of Works. And this is our regrat, but bleſſed be he who ſent our Saviour to help us. As for the *Cherubs* and the *Ark*, I referre you to *Eſthius* on *Heb.* 9. 5. who will tell you that the Images of the Cherubims on the Ark, were placed not to be worſhipped, but ſet there for ſigns of things to come. And the word *Pſalm* 99. 5. *worſhip at his foot-ſtool*, is not worſhip it, but before it: for it was a type of the Church in which we worſhip. And it is clear the people could not worſhip them, for they were in the Holy of Holies, where the people did not enter, nor ever ſee them. And admit all were true which you alleadge, ſuppoſe there were a command for this, yet there is an expreſs command againſt graven Images. And this rule is our reaſon of doing or not doing. This is *Tertullians* anſwer to ſome in his dayes, who framed the ſame objection, *lib. de Idololatria, by his general law he forbade any Image to be made: and by his ſpecial injunction, commanded the Cherubims to be ſet up.* (Adverr, he ſaith not, to be worſhiped) *ſtay thou till thou get the like warrand, and make no Image againſt the law for worſhip, unleſs he command thee as he did Moſes.*

As for *bowing at the Name of Jesus*, we in this Church take not these words literally, for there be no knees under the earth to bow; but he was exalted, that all should acknowledge him to be Lord and Christ. And they who take it otherwise, will not admit of your consequence; for if it be commanded, it is not an Image nor Will worship. For our pictures of friends, and persons whom we respect, they are like the hangings about our walls. The ornaments of our houses are forbidden by no Law as your Images are. And your bitter expression concerning *our love to the Devil*, is an unchristian sentence, and non-consequential, for it amounteth to this only, we will not break the second Command of the Lord our GOD, therefore we love the Devil, *Hear O Heavens and give ear O Earth!* Now Reader, if this dool be not haled the fault is in me, not in the cause. For it is clear as the Sun that the worship of GOD is much leavened by the Romish way. And albeit there were nothing else to say against them, serious Christians who study holiness, and tender their salvation and consolation, must scunner at their course. Yet for further satisfaction to the Reader, I shal handle here this point more fully, and digest it methodically.

This controversie if it deserve to be called one

one (seeing it should rather be esteemed the denyal of a principle in Christianity, then a controverted point amongst Christians,) is of great consequence. First, Because Idolatrie, as saith *Tertullian lib. de Idololatria*, is *exitium seculi, omne peccatum, the ruine of the generation infected, and a complex of sin*: an Idolater is *Homicida* saith he, *he killeth himself*. It was that said *Luther*, as *Melchior Adamus* testifieth in his life, which brought the Turk into Christendom. The Jews are reported in time of their captivity, to reflect with sad sighs upon that as the chief ingredient in their cup. Albeit an Idol be nothing in the world, 1. *Cor.* 8. 4. nothing of that it pretendeth to be, *nihil formaliter*. Yet the Lord is a gracious GOD, and jealous, and that is a grievous sin which cannot go unpunished long, against which he hath in his word declared indignation, and served inhibition. *Deut.* 4. 12. *Deut.* 5. 8. *Deut.* 16. 22. 2. *Chro.* 33. 17. *Psa.* 97. 7. *Ezek.* 43. 8. *Acts.* 17. 22. 23. *Rom.* 1. 23. 1. *ep. John.* 5. 21. &c. Secondly, If the Romanists be such, we had reason to leave them. *What agreement hath the Temple of GOD with Idols.* 2. *Cor.* 6. 16. we had a fair call to leave her by a voice from Heaven, *Rev.* 18. 4. as the Christians had to flee from Jerusalem to Pella. Thirdly, If Idolatrie

trie be in the skirts of Rome, it must be high madness in any who live in the reformed Church, to hanker after and cleave to them. What will ye go to a Pest-house? Idolatrie is a plague, learn to keep a distance, and take the wind of them. For if ye joyn again in affinity. Will not the Lord be angrie? *Ezra* 9. 14.

In following forth this debate, a method for our better clearing is to be observed. First, What Idolatrie is? And how it differeth from superstition and will worship. Secondly, Whether there be any difference betwixt an Image terminating religious worship, and an Idol, or if in Scripture εἰκὼν and εἴδωλον be promiscuously taken. Thirdly, What is the true state of the question, and whither the Papists be guilty of the breach of the first and second Command, according to the definition of Idolatrie.

Idolatrie, is to be defined here by uncontroverted writters, for if *Protestant* Divines should only define the case, partiality might be alledged, as if we made a definition, to inferre our own conclusion. Therefore to stopp the mouths of adversaries in this, I shal define Idolatrie from Scripture, antiquitie, Popish writters, the testimony of a Jew and a Pagan, this is fair and square dealing, against which none can justly make any exception

exception. Idolatrie *is religious worship, tendered to that which is not* GOD. It is called *religious* worship, for it is not *civil*, relating to the fifth Command which is here handled. But that which is comprized in the first and second, consisting in adoration, trusting, prayer, vowes, worship, swearing, dedication of Temples and dayes. When men give that to Images, Saints, Crosses, Reliques, which is due to GOD, that is idolatry, by the mouth of the spirit speaking in Scripture, *Ex.* 20. 5. *Thou shalt not bow down thy self to them to serve them. Psam.* 97. 7. *Confounded be all they who serve graven Images, who boast themselves of Idols, worship him all ye Gods. Psalm* 115. 8. *They that made them are like them, so is every one that trusteth in them.* Now then, service, bowing, trusting in, or to images is Idolatry, cursed and confounded by the word of GOD. Secondly, Ancients define it thus, *Idolatrie is that Quæ DEO fraudem facit, honorem debitum, DEO denegans, & conferens aliis.* So saith *Tertullian lib. de idololatria*, that is *Idolatrie*, which purloineth honour from the Lord, and giveth it to others beside him, as adultery giveth conjugal benevolence to others, beside the husband or wife. *Idolum* saith *Isidorus in Juis Origin: lib.* 8. *cap.* 11. *Est simulachrum, quod humana effigie factum*

&

& conſecratum eſt. That is an *Idol* which is made like a man, and conſecrated for worſhip. So the exhibition of Religious worſhip to that is Idolatrie, according to him. *Aug. epiſt. 119. ad Jan.* ſaith, *in primo præcepto prohibetur cultus aliqua ſimulacrorum hominum DEI ſimilitudo, quia nulla imago ejus colli debet niſi illa quæ hoc eſt quod ipſe, nec pro illo aut cum illo.* In the firſt Command (where he taketh in the ſecond) to us every ſimilitude of GOD is forbidden to be worſhiped, becauſe nothing ſhould be worſhiped with him, or for him, but He himſelf alone. Then according to him, worſhip given to any Image made with hands not being God is Idolatrie. Then it will follow, firſt, that the Gentiles did not alwayes worſhip a falſe GOD, as ye ſhal afterwards hear. And next, that the *Images* repreſenting the true God, worſhiped by them were Idols. So that worſhip muſt be Idolatrie wherever it is. The Adulterie of a Pagan and a Chriſtian are one. So the Idolatrie of the one and the other cannot be diverſe, whatever difference may be otherwiſe amongſt them. *Gerſon* ſayeth, *Varietas imaginum, plurimos ad idolatriam pervertit.* Thereby implying that ſtatue worſhip, as practiſed by Romaniſts, was Idolatrie. *Joſephus* a Jew *con. Appio.* ſaith, it is abominable to place any *Image* in the

the temple of God, and declaimeth against *Pilat* for intending the like. *It* is known, how averse the Jewes after the captivitie were, from this way, whatever pollutions formerly they committed. Religious worship, rendered to *Images*, was detested by them, and reckoned Idolatrous. *Varro* a heathen, as he is cited by *Aug. lib. 4. de civit: Dei*, sayeth, that at Rome in the beginning, *fuit purior Dei cultus, sine simulachris, centum septuaginta annis*. Then by the twilight of Pagans, the worship is polluted, which is by *Images*. And in Pagan Rome, it was free of that 170. years. Afterwards they took in Images, and multiplyed their Gods, so were they given up as the Apostle telleth, *Rom.* 1. 23. By all these it is evident that Idolatrie is religious worship, given to that which is not GOD.

Idolatry, Superstition, and Will-worship, maybe thus distinguished. *Superstition* is according to the Etymologie of the word, *supra statutum*, and may be in many cases where there be no worship at all. As when men are afraid of the signs in Heaven, *Jer.* 10. 1. 2. If they meet such a foot in the morning, if people be affrighted with dreams, vain divinations, as the falling of salt, &c. And be charmed from dependance by faith on the word of GOD. That is superstition,

which ordinarily prophecieth according to their ſentiments, all the fears they imagine. The Papiſts would willingly take with ſuperſtition, if we make Scripture the ſole rule of faith and manners. In this they are not unlike ſome Witches, who will acknowledge, when pannelled, groſs crims, ſuch as adultery drunkenneſs, ſwearing, Sabbath breaking, that they may be thought the more ingenuous in denying Witch-craft. *Bell. lib. 2. de Imag. cap.* 8. ſaith no leſs, *Non eſt tam certum, an imagines DEI, & ſanctæ Trinitatis, ſint faciendæ in Eccleſia? It is not ſo certain, whither the Images of GOD, and the holy Trinity ſhould be made in the Church?* And he thinketh that worſhip given to theſe, to be founded only upon opinion. Therefore he muſt acknowledge it, at leaſt to be ſuperſtition. *Will-worſhip* is where there is no ſtatute terminating it. As the worſhipping of Angels *Col.* 2. and they go away from it, with this return, *who hath required it at your hands?* Thus all Idolatrie is ſuperſtition, and Will-worſhip. For the Apoſtle *Acts* 17. calleth the *Athenian* worſhip ſuch, and maketh uſe of a general ſmooth word, to diſpoſe them the more, for hearing; or becauſe, it may be there was no Image there, but an Altar to the unknown God. Yet all ſuperſtition, and will-worſhip, is not Idolatrie, although

although all of them are damnable, *Ezek.* 43. 8. and religious worſhip ſhould not be vain do they worſhip me, *Matth.* 15. 9. ſaith our Lord, who do ſo.

† *Tertull. de Jejunio cap.* 13.

ex arbitrio humano ſed imperio divino †, *in*

There be no difference in ſcripture betwixt a conſecrated Image and an Idol. If an image terminat worſhip, make it the brazen Serpent, it is an Idol. And that *ſculptile* forbidden in the ſecond Command, the Hebrew word ſignifying it, is *Peſel*, which is ordinarily rendered by the 70. γλυπτον, ὁμοιωμα, *Deut.* 4. 16. and in the 4. of the *Judges* the word is twice rendered γλυπτον. The greek word εἰκων which is a name giv̄e to *paga idols Rom.* 1 23& the image of the beaſt *Re.* 13. 14 is called εἰκων τῦ θηρίου, the worſhip whereof no Chriſtian can deny to be idolatrie. *Image* in Latine is, *quaſi imitago*, and εἰδωλον, is ordinarily rendered *ſimulachrum*, *imago*. *Hippocrates Aph.* 18. calleth the body of a man without the ſoul *Idolum*. The truth of this cauſeth *Lorinus* confeſs, that *apud profanos authores*. i. e. *Criticks* and *Humaniſts*, εἰδωλον and εἰκων *Æque late patent*, *& ſi latinitate utraque daretur eadem eſt ſignificatio idoli & iconis. Sed apud Eccleſiaſticos*. i. e. *Popiſh writters it is not*. So now let any reaſonable man judge, whither byaſſed Papiſts, or learned Criticks, not involved in

the controversie, can give the soundest sense of these words? And seeing the Hebrew signifying both is one, if it be safe to hazard Salvation upon a distinction, meerly nominal without a sure ground of Scripture or reason?

Λατρεια and δουλεια in scripture, and amongst Humanists are promiscuously taken, for the Hebrew word *Gnabad*, is indifferently taken, and signifieth *service*: which is rendered by the 70. interpreters, sometimes by δουλευειν, sometimes by λατρευειν. For instance *Daniel* 6. 20. the speach of the King *Darius* to *Daniel*, is thus rendered by the 70. ἡ δουλος τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζωντος, ὁ Θεος ὃν συ λατρευει ἐνδελεχως &c. *Daniel* servant of the living GOD, is the Lord whom thou servest constantly, able to deliver thee from the Lyons? In one verse δουλευειν and λατρευειν are taken for one. And it is ordinar in the Old Testament to render the word *Gnabad* by δουλευειν. Yea more, in it self the word δουλος coming from *dal*, signifieth the most submisse service: so it is absurd to say it belongeth to Saints, and not to GOD, whom we should most humbly serve. And in the New Testament in more then 40. several places, as *Pasor* proveth fully, these words are synonyma, which *I* need not here transcribe, seeing the book is common †. Now is it not great boldness in men to break

† *The Ap. Gal.* 4. 8. *con-*

the second Commaud, upon the pretended distinction of δουλεια and λατρεια.

The state of the question betwixt us and Romanists is this, whither they by their worship break the first and second Command: and so are guilty of Idolatrie, this they deny. And we prove by these following arguments.

Arg. first, Who ever do give religious worship to that which is not GOD, are guilty of Idolatrie, but the Papists do so. *Ergo*, The *major* is the definition, already confirmed. The *minor* is thus proved, they worship religiously Saints, Angels, Crosses, Reliques, Images, bow down to them, build Temples, make Processions, light Tapers, which *Hierom* calleth *insignia Idololatriæ*, therfore they give to these religious worship. Beside it is not civil worship, *Ergo*, it is religious, for there is no midle worship betwixt these two. Further the Council of *Trent* in the decree concerning Reliques, appointeth worship to them, *opis impetrandæ causa*. Is not this to trust in them for help? They give to Angels and Saints that which *Peter* refused from *Cornelius*, yet his pretended successour claimeth it thrice together; once at the door, the second in the midle of the room, and the third when they kiss his foot †. They give that to Angels which the Angel

demns δουλεια *as given to these which are not GOD, such are all saints Angels & Images. Ergo.*

† *See St. Amours Iournal.*

Angel inhibited *John* twice to do, *Rev.* 19. 10. *Rev.* 22. 8. And say it was refused by the Angel out of modestie: whereas it is seriously forbidden with this reason, *worship GOD*, which is a sufficient rule, directing us to give religious worship to none but GOD. *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy GOD and him only shalt thou serve.* The distinction of Δουλεια and Λατρια serveth for no use here as is above proved. And when they say, that it is not as to GOD; let their *Breviaries*, † *Rosaries*, service books, testify the contrar, which giveth them religious adoration by prayer, praises, kissing, confidence. And will this satisfie a husband from an adulteress, that albeit she committed unclean ness with another, yet it was not with that conjugal affection due to her husband. Now how can such an evasion then, satisfie the conscience of a Papist, or sustain before the Lord Jesus who is the husband of his people? It is clear hence, that by so doing they break the first Command, and have other Gods beside him, whom they make Omniscient, Omnipresent, in whom they trust, from whom they seek aid and help.

† *See Breviarium Aberdonense, Printed at Edinburgh, 1508.*

Arg. second, They who worship Images with religious worship, and break the second Command, are guilty of Idolatrie, because they worship the work of mens hands. But

the

the Romanists do this, *Ergo, &c.* In answering this they do not agree amongst themselves; some of them deny the *Major*, as *Vasquez lib. 2. de ador. disp. 4. cap. 4.* for he confidently averreth that *Illa Mosaica legis prohibitio*, meaning the second Command, *fuit juris positivi & ceremonialis, quæ tempore Evangelii cessare debet*, he calleth it a ceremonial precept, which bindeth not us under the Gospel. This is short work, he repealeth the Law; because he will not obey it. But why may not the first Command be declared ceremonial, upon the same ground, especiallie by Papists, who make the second a part of the first. And if so, Paganism may be brought in by Romanists into their cõsistorie, which many fear to be rankly rooted there. He who said, *Thou shalt not bow down to a graven Image*, said also with the same authority, *Thou shalt have no other Gods but me, Et è contra.* This man hath few followers. Therefore some deny the minor, as *Durand, lib. 3. dist. 9. quæst. 2.* who asserteth that they do not worship Images; but that which is represented by the Image. So it is relative worship, and the Image is a representative only, and memoriall of the right object. Now this answere is naught, for if that be, why do they not likewise worship all the creatures, seeing they declare the glory

glory of God, and may be memorials? Secondly, the *Councill of Trent* condemneth this glose, which in its decree *de imaginibus*, sayeth, that *debita veneratio ijs impertienda est*, i.e. *due worship is to be attributed to them*, viz, to Images. They according to their manner, do not declare what manner of worship should be imparted. But it is sure they mean not civil worship, therefore it must be religious. Thirdly, it is tendered to the Image it self, *in prima instantia*, therefore the Image terminateth the worship, and is more then a memoriall. Thirdly, the vulgar cannot distinguish betwixt *Versus* and *Circa*, *Relative*, and *absolute* worship: therefore to them it must be a snare. How dangerous is it to cast and knit a snare for people, and stumble the weak.

Some distinguish the *Minor*, as *Thomas Bonaventure &c.* and say, that the same worship should be given to the Image, which is given to that represented by it, whether it be λατρεια, δουλια, or ὑπερδουλια. and yet say they it is not Idolatrie, because they worship not the timber or metall, but the Image, in regard of its forme or signification. And they worship not the Image of a false God, which they allendge to be forbidden only in the second Command. So *Aquinas part. 3. q. 25. Bonavent. lib. 3. dist.* But if this answer hold good,

good, then the Pagans were not Idolaters: For they denyed that they did worship a stock or a stone. *Aug. on Ps.* 114. bringeth in the Pagan answering thus, *Non simulachrum colo, sed ejus rei signum quam colere debeo.* And again, *Non stipites colimus, sed qua illis regendis præsident numina. We worship no stocks, but the* Numen *which presideth over the Image.* And upon the 97 *Ps. Non illud colo quod video,* i. e. *the timber or stone, sed servio ei quem non video. I serve him whom I see not.* Secondly, They who worshipped the brazen Serpent, did not worship the piece of brass, but the forme of it. And they thought not that it had innate vertue, yet were guilty of Idolatrie. Thirdly, It is clear from scripture, that some of the Heathen, especially at first, did worship by the Image the invisible GOD who made all things, *Acts* 17. 23. *him whom ye ignorantly worship do I declare unto you.* Yet were Idolaters. And *Rom.* 1. 23. *They changed the glory of the incorruptible GOD, into an Image made like man.* It was the incorruptible God his Image, and withall Idolatry. But fourthly, If only the Image of false Gods worshipped, make Idolatrie, then Israel was not guilty of Idolatrie: But Israel was thus guilty, *Ergo, &c.* It is image-worship whether of the true or false Gods which is here forbidde.

For it is certain that the Golden-calf was intended by them to represent the true GOD. *Exod.* 32. 5. *To morrow is a feast to the Lord*, and 2. *Chro.* 33. 17. *They sacrificed in high places, yet to the Lord their God only.* The like may be said of the Calves at *Dan* and *Bethel*, *Ps.* 106. 20. And of *Micahs* Image. For he confidently sayeth, *Now know I that the Lord will bless me, Judges* 17. *because I have a Levit to be my Priest.* They used not Levits, for the worship of false Gods. Further, the speech of *Stephen* seemeth to prove it strongly, *Acts* 7. 40. 41. for speaking of *Israels* worshiping the Calf, he saith, *The Lord for this gave them up to worship the host of Heaven.* Now when sin is punished by sin, that sin which is the judicial punishment, useth to be more gross then the antecedent sin, which is the procuring cause: but the worshiping the host of Heaven, is not so gross as the worship of an Oxe: therefore they did worship GOD at first by the representation of a Calf, yet were Idolaters. This answer then cannot satisfie the conscience of reason of any man. And admit that the Image of false Gods is forbidden in the second Command, how dare Papists without warrand, and contrar to the word, make the Image of the true GOD, which he hath expressly forbidden? *Deut.* 4. 12. Seeing

15 *Omni-*

16

Omnis cultus saith *Tertullian*, *de Jejunio*, should be *ex imperio divino, non ex arbitrio humano*. Lastly, We are forbidden *to worship the likeneſs of any thing in the Heaven above, or in the Earth beneath.* Now the Lord GOD is in the Heaven above gloriouſly, therefore we ſhould not make his Image, *for to what can ye liken him?* ſaith he. *Iſaiah* 40. 18.

Bellarmin de Imag. and *Gregorius de Valentia*, diſtinguiſh the *Major* another way, and reject the two former anſwers as extream. For firſt, they ſay that they worſhip Images properly, ſo they are againſt *Durand* a great *Anti-Thomiſt*, who maketh them only memorials. Secondly, They ſay, that they give them not worſhip equal to the Pattern, ſo they renounce *Thomas* and all his adherents, *Valent. lib.* 3. *diſp.* 6. ſaith, it is not *ſicut DEO*, that they worſhip the Image of the Trinity. *Bellarmin* ſaith further, that *it is not Æque certum an Imagines Trinitatis ſint in Templis collocandæ, & reverendæ.* Yet ſay they, that veneration ſuitable to them is to be rendered. Which is the ambiguous phraſe of the Council of *Trent*, like the Delphian oracle. If this anſwer hold good, then *Thomas* and all his Clients are guilty of Idolatrie, for they give veneration to Images equal with the Pattern, all

the *Thomists* say *sicut DEO*, so to the Image.

Secondly, *Cultus religiosus est accidens hominis*, if we speak *Physice*, now gradual difference in these altereth not the kind of worship. Therefore, according to the rules of Logick, the worship is one with the worship of *Thomists*; or else they disclaim a *maxime*, by making the one Idolatrie, the other not.

Thirdly, We are forbidden to bow down to them, therefore the meanest degree of religious worship is forbidden in the second Command. *And they who break the least Command, and teach men so, shal be least in the Kingdom of Heaven, Matth.* 5. 19. Lastly, the seduced people know nothing of this difference. Yea *Bellarmin* thinketh it not fit, that *in concione coram populo*, it should be divulged; and he hath reason to say so, seeing they cannot conceive the groundless distinction betwixt λατρεια and δουλια, for their Clergie men will not make it hold water.

Fourthly, Some as *Eckius* in his *Enchir:* answers nothing but this to the argument, *that it is the tradition of their Church, and Command of their Pope, which they judge themselves obliedged to obey.* If this answer be relevant then they were not faulty, *who with their traditions, made the word of GOD of none effect, Matth.* 15. 6. And Papists

are

are too like the Phariſees in this. Secondly, By that Logick, the Turk may maintain his worſhip of Mahomet, for his Church and Mufti authorize it. Thirdly, The Pope in his Conclave may bring in the Alcoran the next day, for that may have authority from them contrar to the word of GOD.

Arg. third, If Image-worſhip be condemned by all pure antiquity, then this worſhip is not only a breach of the ſecond Command, but contrar to the cuſtom of all the Churches of Chriſt. Upon which argument the Apoſtle layeth ſtreſs, 1. *Cor.* 11. 16. But the firſt is true, *Ergo*, *&c.* The *Minor* is proved thus. Many of the Ancients, as *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Tertullian*, *&c.* Were againſt the art of *ſtatue making*, *Epiph. in his ep. to John* 23. *of Jeruſalem*, abominateth the putting them up in Churches; and ſaith, *is is contrar to ſcripture that any Image ſhould be in the Church of Chriſt*. Now if they wer againſt the making of them, againſt the hanging of them in Churches, much more againſt religious veneration given to them. Secondly, the coun cil called *Eliber*: which is as old, if not older then the Council of *Nice*, made a decree, *that no Image ſhould be in the Church, ne forte quod in parietibus pingatur, colatur, leaſt that which is painted be worſhipped*, and till the ſecond Council of *Nice*, which was in the 8.

Century

Centurie, no such thing as image-worship was approved in the Christian Church. Thirdly, It is an ordinar objection made by *Celsus*, and all Pagans against Christians as I said before from *Lorinus*. Ye have *Nulla Templa, nulla simulachra, nullas aras, quod colitis celatis.* To this objection *Origen* and *Arnobius* answer, yeelding the matter of fact, and vindicating their way, which they could not have done, if Images had been in use amongst them. Further when *Adrian* did build a Temple for himself, the Pagans suspected that it was for the Christians, because it was *sine simulachris, without Images*, whence it is clear, that the Image worship cometh nearer Paganism, then Primitive antiquity. See *Dalaus de Imagin.*

Arg. fourth. That which notwithstanding of all distinctions, draweth and driveth people to Idolatrie, is abominable, but by the confession and confession of some learned Papists, the Romish worship doth involve people into Idolatrie, therefore it is abominable. The *Major* is proved by reason, that when the people made an Idol of the brazen Serpent, the statue was brocken, and called *Nehushtan*, although at first it was appointed by GOD. The *Minor* is thus proved by the testimonies of learned Romanists, as *Polyd. Virgil. de invent. lib. 6. cap.* 13.

Many

Many are now, saith he, become so mad, that they worship the Images of wood and stone, as if they had sense in them, and put more confidence in them then they do in Jesus Christ, or other Saints to whom they are dedicated. *Cassander consult. de imag.* saith, *It is too manifest that the worship of Images hath so prevailed, that Christians seeme to be nothing inferiour to Pagans in adoration of their Idols, they make them with as much vanity, and adore them with as much devotion.* From Scripture, reason, antiquity, the confession and confession of adversaries, it is sure and clear that Papists commit gross Idolatrie, from which all good Christians should flee and make their escape.

Fifthly, Ye mulict the Sacrament of the Supper, contrar to the institution of Jesus Christ, *Matth.* 26. 27. by with-holding the Cup from the people: yea contrar to the doctrine of the Apostle *Paul* which he received from the Lord, 1. *Cor.* 11. 25. where all the Communicants for the most, were common Professours. And albeit our Lord command this to be done, till he come again without any substantial alteration, yet sacrilegiously, *hoc non obstante*, as saith your *Counsell of Constance*, ye with-hold the Cup from the people, and give them only the Bread. § 5. *Inst.*

The answer given to this is as followeth, that *Papists Protestants Reply.*

Protestants in denying real Presence, against the expreſs words of Scripture, This is my Body, this is my Blood, which is shed for you, not only mutilat the Sacrament, but take it clear away. You give sufficient occasion to other Heretickes, to say that Christ was no otherwise in the Crib, or the Croſs, then ye say that he is in the Sacrament. Scripture not being more clear for the one then the other. So that denying the real presence, ye destroy and ruine in a manner the incarnation, and very ground of Christianity. But Catholicks, neither take it away from any, nor give it mutilat. Seeing they professe to give Christs glorious and living Body, which is not seperat from the Blood, and who so receiveth the one receiveth the other. It was institutèd not only for a Sacrament, but for a sacrifice, and so I grant that both kynds is requisit on the Altar, but it should not be given to every one, otherwise the very Disciples of the Apostles, had not known how it should be given. For St. Dennis lib. de Eccleſia, he asserteth the communion of Saints under one kind, and St. Cyprian de Lapsis, affirmeth the same of the sick. Yea, when Christians in the Primitive Church in the time of persecution, did carry it home, they did eat it, but under one kind, as Tertullain telleth lib. ad Uxorem. More, Christ himself did give it under one kind, Luke 24.

verse

verse 30. as learned Fathers expound. And the Apostles, Acts 2. 42. and Acts 20. 7. who then can challenge a necessity of taking both kinds? What St. Paul did then was lawful? But what Christ and his Apostles did was no less, which sheweth that the Church may follow, either of these examples, for good reasons, as she thinketh fit.

Answer, Your mutilation of the Sacrament is so clear, that I admire how you can deny it, did not the *Council of Constance* establish it, *hoc non obstante, i. e.* notwithstanding the institution, &c. Your citations for proof are mismarshalled. For first you cite *St. Dennis, Cyprian, Tertullian*, and then *Scripture*, which sheweth your respects for the word. But I cannot follow your Method in this. Therefore know, that the place *Luke* 24. v. 30. maketh nothing for you. You say Fathers interpret it so, but tell us not who they are, so their interpretation is no more but your word; but to shew that there be no mention, in that place of the Sacrament. First. There was no cup at all there, at least none is mentioned. How then can you make it a Sacrament, seeing you say to us that both kinds are necessar to a sacrifice, and the Sacrament of the Supper is such say you. Reconcile your self with your self if you can? Here there was no Sacrifice, *Ergo*, no Sacra-

Protestants Duply.

ment. Secondly, It is sure this was an ordinary meal, honoured with Christ his presence. And for proof of this read *Jansenius* on these words. *There be some* saith he, *who would take an argument from this place, that it is lawful under one kind to give or receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which opinion is neither certain, nor hath it any likelyhood of truth. We are commanded to eat and drink at that table, how we shal make eating, eating and drinking too (saith he) can hardly be perceived.*

That breaking of bread, Acts. 2. 46. is interpreted, *to be eating their meat at home, with gladness and singleness of heart. Oecumenius, Lyra, Cajetan, Carthusian,* say, it is only meaned, *de communi victu, non de Eucharistia.* So saith *Lorinus* also on the text. *Existimo, hic de Eucharistia non esse sermonem, sed de victu quotidiano, vel convivio, quod ἀγαπὰς appellant.*

So that place *Acts* 20. *Lyra, Carthusianus, Cajetanus,* make it corporal refection only, for they say, the Disciples did conveen to eat with *Paul,* before he went away, and this is proved from the 11. v. But grant that place, *Acts* 20. to be meaned of the Sacrament, which is probably maintained by others, it will no more follow, that the Apostle did mutilat it there, then that he preached

preached without Prayer, seeing the one is no more mentioned then the other. *Lorinus* saith, he could not make use of this text, for Communion *sub una specie*, against an adversary.

Your citation from *St. Dennis* maketh little for you. For supposing his testimony to be real, the administration of it to Infants was contrary to the institution, as well as under one kind. We know Infants can drink before they can eat, if any such thing was, it is liker an administration to Infants, then to discerning Christians; It is true that they used to carry home the bread, as you imply from *Tertullian* and *Cyprian*, but did alwayes take the cup *in præsentia*. But to put this out of doubt, see *Cassander Consult.* 22. *Communion under one kind was not in the Church*, saith he, *till Aquinas his time, anno.* 1265. And is it not against your light and reason then, to argue so against the institution of Jesus Christ? Our judgement about the presence of Christ in the Sacrament, will be heard anone, but it will be no ground for you to mutilat divine ordinances, and clip treacherously the King of Saints his coin.

Sixthly, *To adde to the Sarament of Baptism, Matthew* 3. 11. §6. *Inst.*

Have your Reply is, that there is no command of Christ against it, and if it be against Papista Reply.

Christs command, because he hath not commanded it, then it will follow, that to call Baptism a Sacrament, is against Christs command, for neither hath he commanded this, but by his Church, which also commanded that.

Protestants Answer.

Answer, Here we have *confitentem reum*, that Jesus Christ hath not commanded salt, spittle, &c. to be added in the administration of the Sacrament. If it were a circumstance of the action, the true Gospel Church might command these: But it is a material point of the work, and by parity of reason, ye may adde salt, spittle, oyle, honny or milk, to the Sacrament of the Supper. Neither is it reason to argue from the name to the thing. We call it Baptism with the Scripture. And seeing this implyeth washing with water, it is gross superstition to do this without a warrand, which hath no relation to washing. Sope would have more semblance with that then salt. The name Sacrament is acknowledged not to be a Scripture word; But what Logick is this? The seals of the Covenant are named Sacraments by the Church, *Ergo*, we may adde materials to the work without a warrand. The practise of the *Baptist* objected by me seemeth unanswerable, for you said by it as by a rock, which is not candid dealing. Yet it is your ordinar manner

to

to pass with silence material arguments.

Seventhly, Ye adde to the Bible humane traditions, which ye equalize, and in a sort prefette to it. This is point blank contrar to the Word, *Deut.* 4. 2. *Rev.* 22. 18. *If any man adde to these things, GOD shal adde to him the plagues written in this book*, so ye have to fear a plague in due time. §7. *Inst.*

Reply, *These are open calumnies, made to deceive the people in Pulpits, as I have shewed, reflecting on your first answer. And prove against summarily by this Syllogism, what is expresly contained in Scripture, is not contrar to it: But this is expresly commanded*, 2. Thess. 2. 1. Hold fast the traditions which ye have received. *Neither are your citations of* Deut. *or* Rev. *to any purpose. For when it is said there*, If any man shal adde to these things, GOD shal adde to him the plagues written in the book. *Of necessity it must be understood of these books only, adding any thing as a part of them, otherwise it will exclude all other Scripture, as well as tradition. But it may be you think the* Revelation *the last written book of Scripture, and that St.* John *there did speak of all the Bible. But this is a conceit out of ignorance, seeing* Chemnitius *your great Gun, sayes, his Gospel was written after the* Revelation. *And some say so of his* Epistles, *in the very last of which* Papists Reply.

and

and last verse, he sayes, I have many things to writ unto you, but not with pen and ink, but I trust to come unto you and speak face to face. *But ye would not have believed him speaking face to face, who will beleeve nothing but that which is written.*

Protestants Deputy.

Answer, You again defend traditions, by your old argument, *A genere ad speciem affirmative,* which is none concludent, as I have proved fully already upon the sixth question, to which I referre the Reader. And your answer to the 4. *Deut.* and *Rev.* 22. confuteth your self. For you grant that it is not lawful to adde any thing as a part of these books. Then say I, it is as unlawful to adde traditions as a part of the Bible, and make an entire object of faith with both, which is your doctrine. If the Pirrat was faulty for taking a ship, *Alexander* was more fauky by taking of Nations. We will put nothing to the Scripture that way. For then we might make a new Bible, and nothing into our Creed, but what was written by the Penners of it. You make me ignorant of the time when the *Revelation* was written, and goes about to father that on me, which came not into my mind. How far and wherein we hold traditions, *Vide supra,* on Quest sixth, I have no delight to make repetitions.

§8. *Inst.* Eightly, Ye mis-regard the Lords-day, and

celebrate

celebrate dayes of your own devysing, contrar to and without any warrand from the Word, see *Gal.* 4. 10.

You reply that these are calumnies, for we are taught to keep the Lords-day most religiously, and with it the holy dayes of Christs-Birth, Circumsion, adoration by the Kings, presentation in the Temple, the feasts of the Mother of GOD, of the twelve Apostles, of some Martyrs, and other Saints, upon the same ground of Apostolick tradition, and ordinance of the Church, which the Scripture commandeth us to hear & hold fast. & so what we do in this, is neither contrar to Scripture, nor without warrand from the written Word. And your citation may be as well applyed against your observation of dayes of humiliation and thanks-giving. For that place forbiddeth only Heathenish or Jewish days, or dismal days, superstitiously keeped on frivolous remarkes. See Hierom on the place, Aug. cont. Argenant. cap. 16. *and* in his epist. 118. cap. 7. *and hear the same* Aug. *speaking of all our holy dayes in expres terms, which* Protestants *taking away, what St.* Aug. *saith may creep in, both ungrateful forgetting of Christs mysteries, and unkind oblivion of his Saints.* *Papists Reply.*

You call this Argument a Calumnie; but it is too well known how small regard is had to the Lords day throughout the Popes Dominions *Protestants Duply.*

minions. And how farre other dayes of humane institution, are by you preferred to them. And for *Aug.* whom you cite, as the main patron of them; he was so far from approving the trash of his time, brought in by the devices of men, in the worship of God, that in his 119. *ep.* he sayeth, *If they continue, they will become Heathnish and Judaize in many things.* So according to *Hieroms* exposition on the text, *Gal.* 4. 10. concerneth you, for some of your stuff is *Judaicall* some *Paganish*. *Polyd. Virgil de invent. lib.* 4. *in proœmio*, sayeth, *That a verie world of Jewish and Heathnish ceremonies, pestereth the Lords field. Agrippa de Vanit. cap.* 6. sayeth, That Christians now, are more oppressed with ceremonies, then the Jewes were. The Jewish holy dayes were but few in respect of the Romish, for they had but their Passover, Pentecost, feast of Tabernacles, of Trumpets, Reconciliation, New-Moons, Purim, and Dedication, the most of which were of divine institution. These have holy dayes for every Saint, *All saints, all soules, for the Cross, Corpus Christi*, two dayes every week, Lent fast, *&c.* without any warrand from scripture, or pure antiquitie. For *Aug.* sayeth, *ep.* 86. against *Urbicus*, we are indeed commanded to fast, but I find not the dayes prescribed in the Evangelicall or Apostolicall writtings.

The

The ſame ſaith *Socrates*, that it was left by the Apoſtles to every mans free choiſe, *lib. 5. cap. 22.* and *Eraſmus* on the 11. of *Matth.* complaineth, that in *Hieroms* time there were few holy dayes beſide the Lords day, but now they were unreaſonable and burdenſome, becauſe of their multitude. Thus you ſee neither *Hierom*, nor *Aug.* favour your holy dayes, unleſs it be in your *Utopian tractate contra Argentinam*: for there is non ſuch among his workes. You might eaſily perceive that *Gal. 4. 10.* doth not militate as much againſt our dayes of humiliation or thankſgiving, as your holy dayes, if you would conſider. Firſt, We have more regarde to the Lords-day, not any of theſe, this we deſiderat mainly in you, for as ye preferre humane traditions to the Scripture, ſo do you theſe your dayes, to the Sabbath of the Lord. Secondly, Our dayes of humiliation and thankſgiving, are not nimious for number, nor onerous to the people: but yours are ſuch, that many of your own complaine on them, as *Polydore Virgil. in præmio*, and others. And if *Aug.* complained ſo of theſe in his own time, what would he ſay now, if he were living? Will ye hear what he ſaith, *Epiſt. 119. Omnia talia quæ ſanctarum Scripturarum authoritatibus continentur, nec in Conciliis Epiſcoporum ſtatuta*

inveniuntur, nec consuetudine universa Ecclesia roborata sunt, ita ut vix, aut omnino nunquam, inveniri possunt causæ, quas in eis instituendis, homines sequuti sunt; sine ulla dubitatione resecanda existimo. Then he saith, all such things which stumble the weake, and are detrimental not founded on Scripture, are to be cut off. And again, albeit it cannot be found out, *Quomodo contra fidem sint.* Yet, *ipsam Religionem premunt servilibus oneribus, ita ut tolerabilior sit conditio Judeorum,* because, *non humanis præsumptionibus ita subjiciuntur.* Is he not clearly then against your way? Thirdly, In observing the Sabbath, we regard at that time the work for the day, but in the dayes of fast and thanksgiving, we regarde the day occasionally for the worke. Fourthly, We have in observing these, no cognation with Jewish or Pagane times, whereof ye may be impeached, and cannot plead not guilty.

§ 9. *Inst.* Ninthly, Ye condemn marriage as carnall to some, contrare to the Apostle *Heb.* 13.4. and make it a Sacrament to others. So ye confound your self, making it both Sacramentall, and Sacrilegious to the elect of God; whereas *Enoch* walked with God, and begat sons and daughters *Gen.* 5. 22.

Papists Reply. *To reply to this, that we Ministers are addicted to marriage, and therefore should not offend*

offend that it is called a Sacrament. Then that it is so called Eph. 5. *and by the Greek Fathers who understood their own language. And that ye condemn it not as sacrilegious in any but such as take on the vowes of chastitie, povertie, &c. And that it is malice in Ministers to call Vertues, Vices.*

Here you contradict your self, for in answer to the fixt Question, you denyed that the word *Sacrament* was at all in scripture, which is true, and yet now you alleadge, that it is to be found in the 5. *Eph.* and marriage is so called. Beside your contradiction, you speak ignorantly, by telling *that the Greek Fathers, who understood their own language, called marriage a sacrament*; whereas the word is Latine, and not Greek. If that place of scripture be read by any, it will soon appear, that marriage betwixt man and woman is not called a mysterie, but that which is between Christ and his Church *vers* 32. For the marriage of Ministers, I see not why it should be blamed, seeing it is holy in all. *Heb.* 13. 4. Nor how any should take on the vow of chastitie, who have not the gift from God. The Apostle sayeth, it is good in time of persecution, for the present distress for a man not to be married. 1. *Cor.* 7. It is *Bonum utile*, but it is better to marrie then to burne. A chaste life, is commendable in

Protestants Duty. 1.

any Christian, and a *Celebs* state, may free him of many cares and snares: but to tye all Clergie men to it, whither they have the gift from GOD or not, is a sin. And your encroatchment on the divine ordinance, and appointment of GOD, hath filled your Church with whordoms and adulteries, your Cloysters and Nunries with abominable uncleanness, and murders of children. It is too well known how the vow of chastity is kept by your Church-men: And if any doubt of it, let them read the late relation of the Ambassadour of *Venice*, concerning the present state of the Church at Rome, and he will tell you, that some of the most eminent Cardinals there, will frequently be under *Lues Venerea*. Is it not better to marry then to sin thus? I appeal to your own conscience.

§ 10. *Inst.* Tenthly, Ye teach for doctrine, the Commandements of men, contrar to scripture, for it is reproved *Matth.* 15. 9. And do dye your worship wholly with these colored antick gestures, so that in your worship ye are more like to Monkies, then reasonable men, and guidie stage-players, then solid Christians, who worship God in spirit and in truth

Papists Reply. Reply, *This citation is often answered. It is not known of what gestures you speak, as if only you did see the gestures of worship of the Catholick Church. But one thing is sure, that*

it

it is a very childish calumny: Our gestures being so grave that they move men to devotion and do accompany GODS worship with decency, Majestie, better then your gaping like distracted men, your affected sighs and howlings. You cite again two words of Scripture, that we should worship in spirit and in truth, to condemn reverend and grave gestures of the body in time of worship, as if men were pure spirits.

I answer, that albeit I have not seen your worship, yet I have heard the forme of it from sundry discerning men, who had seen it, and told me how Apishand Histrionick it is. And it is strange how any can deny it. Seeing the reacting of the Earth-quake, of the renting of the vale of the Temple, of the darkness about the time of the Passion, your crossings, your kissings, your kneelings, your whisperings, washings, anointings, spittings, breathings, saltings, &c. What are they but many idle observations? Your incense on your Altars, your candles wherewith ye burne day-light; do they not savour of *Judaism* and *Paganism*? And are far more like stage work then sincere worship. And if these be not the commandements of men, why produce ye not Scripture for your warrand? We are not against reasonable service, both with the spirit and body, but think that bodily exercise alone, profiteth little, and the marrow of the work, is to worship

Protestants Duply.

GOD in Spirit.

§ 11. *Instr.* Eleventhly, Ye think it lawful to equivocat in some cases, to dispence with lawful Oaths. But Scripture sayes, *It is a snare after vowes to make enquiry, Pro.* 20. 25. *And that the man shal only inhabit the holy mountain, who speaketh the truth in his heart, Ps.* 15. Thus ye Popelings are scarce for moral fellowship, seeing no words can tye you. Doleful experience proveth this: in that your Council of *Constance* murdered *John Huss* and *Hierom of Prague*, contrar to the solemn warrand for security of their lives. And then said by way of poor defence, that faith was not to be keeped to Heteticks.

Papists Reply. *To this it is replyed thus, In your eleventh Section, you are not ashamed to set down in writ, that we think it lawful to lie, which no Catholick did ever writ or say. But ye Protestants brought in your Religion by lies, as if the whole Church before them had erred in matters of faith, and making poor ignorants believe, that Catholicks do adore stocks or stones, give GODS worship to Saints or Angels, think to be saved by their own works, without the merits of Christ, that there be nothing required for remission of sins, but tel them to a Priest, that the Pope giveth pardon for by-gone sins and sins to come, all which are open lies. So they continue it by lies and*

gross

groſs calumnies], which maketh the people though wearied of many alterations and innovations in their Religion, yet profeſs it outwardly, as if there were none better. As for equivocating, I grant it is a probable ſentence, (although no article of our Creed,) that men may equivocat in ſome caſes, but not in anſwer to any juſt interrogative before a lawful judge. And as for that you ſay in ſome caſes, we diſpence with lawful oaths, it is true, for there be many oaths with which we not only diſpence, but put a tie on men not to keep them, &c. But when oaths are lawfullie made and continue lawful in all circumſtances, both for GODS glorie, and the greater ſpiritual good of the people, we diſpence with none. As Vowes of chaſtity, obedience to the ſuperiour, and Paſtours of the Church. But I hope you will hardly perſuade any, that Popelings as you call them, (not regarding Kings, and Queens of that profeſſion, more then if they were bonnet-makers in Dundee,) are ſcarce for moral fellowſhip, as if no word nor oaths could tie them. There being many old men yet living who remember, ſome to have ſeen, and ſome to have heard that in the time, the Catholick Religion did flouriſh in this Kingdom mens words were better then their hands now. And that ſince the reformation, which is but a hundred and three years ago. There

hath

hath been more rebellion, falſhood, and perjurie, then in 300. years before. Neither had John Huſs *nor* Hierom of Prague, *been in any danger in the* Council of Conſtance, *if they had keept the conditions, upon which ſecuritie was promiſed to them. And ſo faith is onlie not to be keeped to Heretickes, when they keep not the conditions upon which it is promiſed: which is common to them with all others, and the* Council of Trent *hath declared* Seſſ. 25, *that to violat the leaſt part of publick faith given to Heretickes, is a thing puniſhable both by the law of GOD and man.*

Proteſtants Duply. There be here many words and little more. You grant that in ſome caſes equivocation is taught as a probible dutie: but deny that it is lawful to lie. Is not equivocation lying? Are they not both contrar to ſpeaking the truth in the heart? A liar ſhould have a good memorie. Otherwiſe, I ſee he will ſoon contradict himſelf, as you do here. Well then, ye will paſs with equivocations, unleſs it be before a Bench. This is your Topick. Will it not clearly follow, that ye are not for moral fellowſhip which is extrajudicial? So, if I be to bargain with a Popiſh perſon, a Court muſt be conveened, and there he will poſſibly ſpeak truth to a Judge, but otherwiſe he is taught to diſſemble with me. That this is your doctrine

doctrine, and lies also taught by you, see it fully proved by learned *Mr. William Dow-glas*, in his late Treatise *de Æquivocations*, which you cannot refute nor refuse. Your dispensing with oaths, you say is, when the oath is unlawful. But I intreat you tell me, if you judge the oath of alledgeance to a lawful King an unlawful oath? For it is clear ye dispence with such, as shall appear afterwards. Or is the marriage betwixt single persons who are not within degrees of affinitie, or consanguinity forbidden by GOD, lawful? It is as true that ye loose such. And was it not a lawful oath that the Emperour gave to *John Huß* and *Hierom of Prague*? Yet the Council of *Constance* dispensed with him, and broke to them, as their death did demonstrat. You say they failed in conditions, but do not set down particulars. This is an invention of your own, what condition did they fail in, can you tell it? *Tutus accessus, & recessus*, was promised to them not keeped, few of your writters adhere to this childish evasion, but tell us plainly that the Emperour had no power to do so, and therefore the Council would not stand to it. You may justifie it you wil also, by some device of this forge, the murther of *Count-Edgmount* and *Horn*, contrar to the tennour of their safe conduct, under trust by

Duke de Alva. The *Council of Trent* seeing the *odium*, this tenet brought on Popery, speak after their manner in general termes, for vindication in time to come. But this net I hope will catch few fowles, unless there be a particular renunciation of that damnable error which I desire heartily all of you to do. Was there not an act of the Council of *Constance Sess.* 19. saying that the safe conduct was *salva justitia*? The German *Protestants* refused to come to the Council of *Trent*, upon their assurance, because of the tenet at *Constance* not clearly renounced. You say, that our Doctrine is carried on with lies, we desire not to lie for GOD, nor mis-state any question betwixt you and us. Truth can stand upon one foot, when a lie will need many proppes, like an old house. If we should fraudulently deceive people, how could we expect a blessing, or assistance from the GOD of truth? It is my wish to the Lord that this may be our Motto, which was the Apostles, 2. *Cor.* 13. 8. But I remarke in your large discourse one notable lie, you say there be old men in SCOTLAND who did live when Popery flourished, and can yet witness what moral honesty was amongst men then: such old men must now be six score years old at least, for you must allow them to be fourteen years, before they could discern

discern the carriage of neighbours and Ancestors in commerce and bargaining, and it is 106. years and above, since the Reformation. If I know where such old men lived, I should have some account from them: but you did not wisely tell us that they were here, seeing one of that age is not to be found with us, far less many. Although this be an untruth, yet I find you speaking some truth here, for you call without any diminution, that work a Reformation, and so indeed it was, although ye hate to be Reformed.

Twelfthly, Ye teach a practice that lawful Magistrats may be deposed by the Pope. Ye will canonize the killers of such, contrar to the Apostle, *Rom.* 13. 1. 1. *Pet.* 2. 13, *Let every soul be subject to the higher powers, and submit to every ordinance of man for the Lords sake.* If your Pope had his will, there would be no Kings, at least none reformed: And Kings have not reason to be content, that there be a Pope, nor yet indulge traffiqueing Papists, seeing it is certain that none holding their tenets, can be a loyal subject to a *Protestant* King, & scarcely to any other. § 12. *Inst.*

Reply, *In your twelfth Sect: you make us teach, that lawful Magistrats may be deposed by the Pope, and that we canonize such. Where citing* Rom. 13. *and* 1. Pet. 2. *you fight with your own shaddow, and make up to-* *Papist. Reply.*

wits contrary to Scripture, which Catholicks detest and abhorre. But this is proper to Herisie, and particularly yours, to cause rebellion from lawful Princes and Magistrats, as it did every where, even in its first beginning witnes the revolting of the Princes of Germany against the Emperour. The bloody warre of the subjects in France 20. years against their King. Holland against Spain to this day, the Suitzers amongst themselves. SCOTLAND first against Queen Mary, and then our late gracious King. Nevertheless, Ministers are so bold as to speak this, who can neither be subject to Kings, Magistrats, nor Bishops, if they oppose their whimsyes in the least. Every one of them taking greater power to himself, then Catholicks giues to St. Peter.

Protestants Answer. *Duply*, Any one may here perceive a studied shifr, by way of recrimination. Because ye dare not declare your selves herein. And do you indeed detest the Doctrine of the whole Canonists, the whole Jesuits, that the Pope may depose a lawful King? If it be so, I am glade you renounce this point of Poperie. But because you say, I fight with my own shaddow herein, to shew how ignorant and impudent you are in this denyal. Lee any read either the bull of *Gregory* the seventh against *Henry* the fourth the Emperor, or of *Sixtus* the 5 against *Henry* the third

King

King of *France*, or of *Pius* the fifth against *Elizabeth* Queen of *England*; and there ye will find this tennor, *Nos in ſupremo juſtitiæ throno collocati, ſupremam in omnes Reges & Principes Terræ univerſæ, cunctoſque populos, gentes, & Nationes, non humana ſed divina inſtitutione obtinentes nobis traditam poteſtatem, declaramus, præcipimus, jubemus, &c.* Viz. That none of their ſubjects ſhould owne or acknowledge them. For your better information in this particular, know that the power of the Pope in this particular, is one way explained by the Canoniſts, and another way by the Jeſuits. For the Canoniſts ſay, that the Pope hath *jura omnia cæleſtis & terreſtris imperii ſibi à Deo conceſſa.* The Jeſuits that *Pontifex ut Pontifex, non habet directe ullam temporalem poteſtatem, ſed ſolum ſpiritualem, tamen indirecte, ratione ſpiritualis, habet poteſtatem quandam, eamque ſummam, diſponendi de temporalibus rebus omnium Chriſtianorum.* See more of this in *Dr. Barclay, de poteſtate Papæ in Principes Chriſtianos.* They hold it beyond doubt, that *in ordine ad ſpiritualia*, which is a broad charter, the Pope may depoſe any King, and looſe their ſubjects from all allegiance to him, *cum ſubeſt cauſa rationalis*†. Secondly, They hold that Biſhops may *omnem*

† *Anno* 1654. *When it was Printed at Naples, by*

authority, that the Pope should not exercise jurisdiction civil in the territories of Spain, without the Kings leave, this was condemned at Rome by Innocent the tenth.

nem movere lapidem, and that is a broad word, *ne dedant sub Hæretico Principe*, *Baron: anno* 438. *Sect.* 89. Thirdly, When the knowledge of the fault is evident Subjects may lawfully, if they have sufficient strength exeem themselves from subjection to their Prince. *Bannes on Thomas quæstion.* 12. and that *ante judicis sententiam declaratoriam.*

Lastly, Privat persons may kill an Heretical King, after sentence is given against him *Suarez defens. fidei Cathol. lib. 6. cap.* 4. only their tenderness appeareth in this, that the King be not constrained wittingly or willinglie, to be the cause of his own death, the sense is this, if you can poyson him by his gloves, garment or saddle, you may do it. But by meat or drink you may not, for then he taketh his own poyson. So *John Mariana de Reg. instit. lib.* 1. *cap.* 7. Is it not then true, that by principles of doctrine, no Papist adhering to the Pope can be a loyal subject to the King? As for our Reformations ye look on all such with an evil eye. But our doctrine in the reformed Church, concerning the Magistrat is such, that no Christians on earth give him more then we do. Wit-

nesse

ness our *Confession of Faith*, to which we will adhere while we live, what ever the scripture and pure antiquitie giveth to Kings, that we willingly render for conscience sake. All sound *Protestants* do abhorre and detest the murther of our late Soveraign Lord the King, and we in this Nation did protest and declare against it, for which our Commissioners were committed close prisoners, and sent with a guard to the border. As for the Reformation abroad, I desire that famous *Mr. Baxter his Key for Catholicks, and dissuasive from Popery*, may be read by you, who hath written so well on this point, that I hope all men satisfiable may be satisfied with his reasons, which I need not here transcribe. See also the testimonie of the Ministers at *London* against that horride murther, to which testimonie we do still adhere and then adhered. But *Quis tulerit Gracchos de seditione, &c.*† Doth not your great *Cardinal Allen*, write an Apologie, for *Stanles* treason against *Queen Elizabeth*. Doth not *Bellarmin* shew *lib.* 5. *de Pontif. cap.* 8. in how many respects Kings may be deposed by their subjects? Did not *Pope Sixtus the fifth*, make an Oration at *Rome*, in commendation of the *Friar* who murthered, *Henry the third King of France*? Was not *Tyrones* treason commenced, and commended by

† *See Bilson of Subjection, page 382.*

your

your Party, who then did take on the coat of Armes, and sound the trumpet of rebellion. When the *Popes Bull* roared in *England* against *Queen Elizabeth*, how many treasons were hatched and evil humours bred in the people?

§ 23. *Inst.* Thirteenthly, Ye say, we are justified partlie by faith, partlie by workes, but the Scripture saith, that *we are justified by faith without the works of the law, and that the man is justified to whom the Lord imputeth faith without workes, Rom. 4. 6. and that we are saved by grace through faith, not of workes lest any man should boast.* Neither can any good workes be wrought by us, till we be justified and sanctified, how can an evil tree bring forth good fruit? Nor can we understand any good work which the law doth not require, seeing it was tendered under the Covenant of grace. Beside, our best worksare leavened with many imperfections and debt for the present, so these cannot absolve us for bygones, or the time to come: And whereas the Apostle *James* chapter 2. speaketh of Justification by workes, his purpose there is onlie to declare what justifieth faith. Now justifying faith must be a lively working faith, and if it be dead it availeth not, and if he hint at personal justification, which verse 29. implyeth, it is before men,

and

and that before the Tribunal of GOD, there all must say, *Enter not into judgement with thy servant, for in thy sight no flesh living can be justified*, *Psalm* 143. 2. And the Church must confess, that all her righteousnes is ragged and as a menstruous cloath.

Reply, *In your thirteenth Section, you denying that we are justified by faith and works, do both contradict scripture and your self. It is the* Epistle of St. James, chap. 2. verse 20. 24. You see then how by works a man is justified, and not by faith only. *No wonder after this ye contradict your self, when you grant that faith is justifying, or made justified by works. For what is it to say that works justify faith? But that faith without works is not justifying. And so that faith justifyeth not all, or no other way then as it is accompanied with good works as two conjunct causes. For as the* Philosopher *saith*, causa causæ est causa causati. *But what needeth any reasoning, if this place be not clear to a Minister, what it clear to ignorants in all the scripture? Wherefore ye had dont better to reject the* Epistle of James *with* Luther, *then to acknowledge it for scripture & to deny that we are justified by faith and works, the two parts of Christian dutie being belief and life. Yet to shew that the place of* St. James *is not to be taken according to the letter, you cite three passages* Papists Reply.

excluding workes of the written law from justifying, but not excluding workes of grace and the Gospel. The first whereof expounded the rest, and St. Augustin *them all*, de fide & operib. cap. 14. *saying*, St. Paul *speaketh of the workes of* Abraham, *in so much as they proceed from the law, excluding the spirit and grace of Christ. Then you say, neither can any good work be wrought by us, till we are justified, for how can an evil tree bring forth good fruit? To which Question, I answer with our Saviour in the Gospel, asking how a good tree can bring forth evil fruit: as* David *committing adulterie. For if you understood the one, you may easilie understand the other. Which if you do not go to the schoole and learne the distinction betwixt* simpliciter and secundum quid, *betwixt good and evil simplie and in part. For as there be few so good, but they do some evil: so there be few so bad, but they do some good, being assisted by* GODS *actual grace, albeit they want sanctifying grace. Yea, very good actions may be done with some little imperfection; which maketh the Prophet compare our righteousneſs to a menſtruous cloath.*

Protestants Duply. *Duply.* You are like to your self all along in this reflection, for I cannot call it a return, seeing you have a flourish of fleetles words, for catching women and children: but do not touch the arguments proposed,

for

for justification by faith without the workes of the law. My first argument was this. That the Apostle *Paul* saith, *we are justified by faith without the workes of Law*, therefore not by them. You say, *he meaneth not of workes of grace*. What then? Of sinful workes before Covertion? And is it indeed like, that sinful workes can be called by the Apostle workes of the law, seeing these are transgressions of the law? Or that the Justitiaries amongst the *Romans* in the dayes of the Apostle, were so grois as to affert, that sinful workes justifie a man which condemn him. Secondly, you say, *that justification by faith contradicteth scripture, James* 2. 24. which place I explained and reconciled with the 4. of the *Romanes*, and all you say to that is, *that I contradict my self*. I said workes justifie faith, for my faith is known by my workes to my self and others. But that will not say, that workes and faith justifie the man. So I clash not with my self here. And for your *Maxime, causa causæ est causa causati*. If I understand this, you contradict your self in the application of it; for faith being the cause of workes and justifying the man, workes are the effect of justification, not the cause of it. Hence the Apostle *James* saith, *shew me thy faith by thy workes, O man!* For it cannot be shewen without workes. v. 18.

Albeit we say that faith alone justifieth, yet that *Fides sola in apprehendendo, non est justificatoria.*

My next argument was, that a man must be justified before he can work well: therefore workes are not the cause of justification. I hope you will not say, that the effect is antecedent to its cause, if you have read *Ramus* Logick. And that a man must be justified before he can work well, I prove thus. He must be sanctified, *Ergo*, &c. *a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit, Matth.* 7. 18. Ere you have not something to say to this, you close with *Pelagius* for a defence, and speak non-sense. For you say, *that you answer with our Saviour, by a distinction of that which is simply such, and secundum quid.* In what part of the Gospel is this Logick to be found? For it is clear from the verse above cited, that our Saviour denyeth simply the thing, so he granteth it not *secundum quid. Some good acts you say, may be done by evil men, being assisted by actual grace.* I would know if actual grace can be in exercise, where habitual grace is not at all? then if men habitually evil, in an unconverted state, can do any thing well? That something materially good may be done by them, as well as sin may be committed by the regenerated, I doubt not: but that they can do ought upon

a good principle, for a good end, by a good motive, I deny it simply. Now if they be not such they cannot justifie a man. For *nullum agens potest agere, extra Sphæram suæ activitatis.* Till he be sanctified he cannot be be such, till he be justified he cannot be sanctified. Workes justifie no more the man, then the fruit maketh the tree good.

My third Reason you leave untouched, which was this, that the present time requireth all our work, *Ergo*, it cannot justifie us for bygones or the future. What is now *debitum*, cannot pay my bygone debt, nor free me for the time to come. And you grant all I have said in the fourth, *that our best workes are imperfect, and so cannot hold water before the Tribunal of GOD.* I am glade to hear you grant so much, for then where will workes of supererogation and merit appear.

For further clearing of our Doctrine of Justification, take notice, the Papists and we thus differ. First, They say there is a two fold justification, one, whereby a man unjust is made just; for attaining this, there must be previous dispositions by the acts of faith, fear, hope, love, which fit the man for his justification, some of them terme this, *Meritum congrui*, others say, that this is the free gift of GOD not deserved by workes. The second Justification, is, that whereby a

man

man being just is made more just: this they say is merited by their workes, and proceedeth *à DEO & arbitrio suoul*, both from free will and GOD. So *Molina*. Here they confound justification and sanctificarion; And by this way we are not compleetly justified till we die, ere the work of sanctification be perfected fully, we must be Saints in light. Secondly, That free gift of grace, is parted betwixt GOD and free-will, if this Doctrine hold. For *Bellarmin* saith, *we co-operat with GOD in justificatoo it self, and the beginning of faith*. So by it that emphatick place, *Rom.* 8. 34. cannot be interpreted aright, it is GOD who justifieth. If man had no part nor hand in the Creation, how can he have it in the first Convertion, seeing that is a new Creation? Thirdly, They make the formal cause of justification, inherent righteousnes, which is ragged by their own confession, as appeareth from this reflecter. Then it is no fit covering for our nakednes, for it self needeth a covering. Can it satisfie divine justice, being so imperfect? *Augustin* telleth the contrar, on *Psalm* 42. *Whosoever liveth here, albeit he live righteously, if that righteousnes be strictly judged, wo to him.* Fourthly, It is not safe nor comfortable for our selves. That same Father telleth us again, *de bono perseverantia, cap.* 6. *we*

live

live most safely when we attribute all to God wholly, then when we commit our selves partly to GOD, partly to our selves. Now this inherent righteousnes, as put on in the second justification, is the birth of merits and free-will say all Papists, then positively and mostly thy own. The merits of Christ are a far off cause, *causa formalis immediata*, is thy own righteousnes; the consideration of this made *Bellarmin* confess, *de justif. lib. 5. cap. 7. tutissimum est in sola DEI misericordia conquiescere: It is safest to repose on the mercy of GOD, not on thy own righteousnes.* A dying Christian serious about salvation, will indeed find it safest and surest. We again maintain that a converted man is under previous law work of conviction, contrition, humiliation, and the fallow ground of the heart is thus prepared, and broken up by the plowing of the Word: but a man may come this length and go no further, the dispositions have not always a necessar connexion with that new birth. Nor is the seed of faith still sown in such as are under the spirit of bondage. He who tasteth of these powers may fall away. There be a relative difference between these acts in the Elect and others. Secondly, When faith the free gift of GOD, *Phil.* 1. 29. is sown into the heart and planted there, as it is native to

the

the child to seek the breasts, so it leadeth and leadeth the man in its first motion, to the righteousness of Jesus a Mediator, who is *The Lord our righteousness, Jer.* 23. 6. and he maketh mention of his righteousness, even of this only. The Lord hath so appointed it, *he is made of GOD to us righteousness*, 1. *Cor.* 1 30. faith apprehendeth that, as the ship-broken man doth a plank, whereby he commeth to land; by that we are justified before GOD. Inherent graces cannot satisfie the justice of GOD, nor make perfect obedience to the law, nor pay the penalty which it requireth. But Mediatory righteousness can do all this. So the causes of justification are these, the final cause is the glory of GOD and mans salvation. The efficient, the favour, mercy, and good will of GOD. The meritorious, the obedience of Jesus Christ. The formal, the imputed righteousness of that blessed Mediator. The instrumental cause or condition, (as some word it) is faith, *Rom.* 3. 24. 25. to we are justified by faith alone, as *Abraham* was before GOD, and this giveth glory to GOD, *Rom.* 4. overthroweth the boasting of men, and is the sure safe scripture way. Now when we say that faith alone justifieth, by laying hold on his righteousness, and applying it, we still hold that faith which justifieth to be

pregnant

pregnant with good workes, such as love, heart-cleansing, new obedience, patience, zeal, and other fruits of the spirit. This adversaries deny not to us. *Bellarmin* doth us this much right, for he acknowledgeth that we hold good workes to be necessar to the justified, *Non necessitate efficientiæ sed præsentiæ*. So they justifie our faith to ourselves and others: but faith justifieth the man, and workes have no place in that act. We do not deny that good workes have room, and are necessarie for working out of our salvation, they are *via regni*, but in the point of Justification they are excluded. Our justification is the Lords act of gracious absolution tendred to us through Christ. When we receive the sentence, faith the hand of the soul layeth only hold of it. And it is not said in Scripture, *love in his blood, or patience, or zeal in it, but faith in his blood*, by which we are justified, cloathed, and covered. Remission and righteousnes commeth in this way. This animateth all our graces, and we hold justification and salvation of free grace, *Ephes.* 2. 8. 9.

Fourteenthly, You set up free will in fallen man, almost as it was under the Covenant of workes in the state of innocencie; and do attribute *Election* partly to that Idol. More that without Christ we may merit congruously § 14. *Inst.*

and naturally dispose our souls for grace. But the Scripture saith, *Rom.* 11. 6. Election is meerly of grace, *and if by grace, then it is no more of works, otherwise grace were no more grace*, but if it be of works, then it is no more grace: otherwise works were no more works. Nay, *We cannot of our selves as of our selves think a good thought.* 2. *Cor.* 3. 5. and without Christ we can do nothing. *John* 15. 5. being by nature children of wrath dead in sins and trespasses.

Papist Reply. *To say we set up free will in faln man, as it was in the state of Innocencie: who can we put great distinction betwixt free will in those two states, as you may see in our School Divines; yet Christ by his grace, hath so set it up, that with the same grace a man may choose to do good and refuse to do evil. Both Scripture and Fathers are clear for this. Scripture*, Deut. 30. 19. I have set before you life and death blessing and cursing, therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live. *And* 1. Cor. 7. 37. He who hath determined in his heart, not having necessitie, but having power of his own will to keep his Virgin. *Is not here free will asserted, necessitie clearly excluded? How then can you call it an Idol? or, if a man have not free will, wherefore serveth preaching, and exhortation, to perswade*

a

a man to that which is not in his power? Protestants *say, there is no good action in the power of a man: Why then do they persuade Roman-Catholicks to turn* Protestant, *seeing Conversion being a most holy and good work, is not in our power of free-will? Or how could it stand with* GODS *wisdom to command men what they could not do? Or with his justice to condemn them eternally, who had not free-will to obey his Commandements? Hear* St. Aug. lib. de Fide contra Manich. chap. 10. Who will not cry out it is a foolish thing to command him who hath not freedom to obey what is commanded? And it is an injurie to condemn him who hath no power to fulfil them. *And again,* lib. de Gr. & lib. Arbit: cap. 2. GOD hath revealed to us in Scripture that in man is free-will, because GODS Commands would not perfect man unless he had free-will to do them, Gregory hom. 12. on Numb. O Israel what doth the Lord thy GOD require of thee? Let them be ashamed of these words, who deny free-will in man. How should GOD require of man, unless man had in his power what to offer to GOD requiring? *Doth he not here speak to you, and clearly against you? Now whereas you cite* Rom. 11. 6. *Election is meerly of grace, you put in the word* (meerly) *which is not in Scripture: And whereas it is*

said, if it be of grace then it is no more of workes, *that is meaned of naturall workes, without grace, or workes of the law. As answer these Doctors, whose sentence you here impugne: for without grace, you say well with the Apostle, we cannot think a good thought, and without Christ we can do nothing*, John 15. 5. *Wherefore it is another calumny, when you make us say that without Christ, we may merit congruously, which we hold for* Pelagian *and* Semi-Pelagian Heresie.

Protestants Duply.

Duply, You reason for Free-will upon *Pelagian* grounds, as *Iansenius*, *Ipr.* who was Popish, hath aboundantly proved in his learned work. If you would read and consider him he would satisfie and refute you. But seeing you gift us with him, and so with *Augustin*, for in these he is *totus Augustinus*, I shal only say this by way of position. First, The naturall man hath no freedom for spiritual good, as before the fall, because he is the servant of sin. Hear *Aug. contra duas epist. Pelagian. Libertas illa quæ fuit in Paradiso, periit per peccatum. Propter quod natura humana Divina indiget gratia, dicente Domino si vos filius liberaverit vere liberi eritis.* He granteth a freedom for evil, but of our selves, as of our selves, we cannot think a good thought, we say the same with Scripture and Antiquitie. Secondly, We

hold

hold that in some moral acts a man hath freedom, whither by a new gift, or as the remainder of the first, I shal not dispute, E. G. He may elocat his Virgin to be married, or not, according to the text cited by you 1. *Cor.* 7. 37. this we do not deny. Thirdly, Commands, threatnings, exhortations, are means appointed by GOD, to make us who are nilling willing to do good, yet so, *that it is he who worketh in us both to will and to do, Phil.* 2. 13. *Who worketh all our workes in us, Is.* 26. 12. So the place you cite *Deut.* 30. 19. maketh nothing against us; for as *Augustin* saith, *jubet & jovat*, and the Elect get grace so obey, these who are approven, will thus be made manifest, so it is not in vain for us to exhort Papists to be converted, for wisdom will be justified of her own children. And did not our Lord upon this account exhort the obstinat Jews to reformation. Yet your argument from exhortations is against him, and his way, asmuch as against us. We have a will, moral faculties of willing and nilling, and are not blocks. *Augustin* throughout meaneth no more, and admit that *Origen* be of your mind, Scripture saith the contrar. If election be of grace without workes, is it not clear that it is of meer grace? For these two are oppost here. You say you do not refuse that, nor set up free-will in man as before

fore the fall, and appeal to your School-men for my information. I answer you make use of the word (grace) as *Pelagius* did *ad fugendam invidiam*, but indeed *Adam* had no more power over his will, then ye give to lost man, which I prove thus: *Adam* could plead for no more but the *posse* by his creation, and the *velle* if he pleased to choose or refuse obedience. But all your Jesuits give this to man after the fall, that *posse omnibus requisitis ad agendum*, (which doth take in the decree, the concourse and grace it self, in the sense of all your *Dominicans* at least, who impugne this description,) yet *potest agere vel non agere*, therefore he hath as much now as before the fall, according to your Divinity. Albeit you condemn *Pelagius* yet ye are wholly his here. See I beseech you *Jansenius* on this subject. Yea ye make your self differ from another contrar to the Apostle, 1. *Cor.* 4. 7. For two having equal grace objective and subjective, it is the will which casteth the ballance, and maketh it efficacious in one, not in another. This is the doctrine of School-men. So ye have your will to thank, your will to invocat for any good. And what more said the *Semi-Pelagians* or *Messalians* then the *Mass-men* do here averre? Your Council of *Trent* saith the will *potest dissentire si velit*, your school-

men

men whom you desire me to consult in this matter are of the same tenets. The council saith *Sess. 6. chap. 5.* that one is converted and another remaineth in his infidelity, the cause is in their will, in that one entertaineth the other rejecteth the grace of GOD. *Molina disp. 12. to hold this, saith he, is a matter of faith. Eckius in his Enchir, saith, that the beginning of our Salvation we have from Gods mercy, but it is in our power to yeeld to that divine inspiration or not. Aquinas contra Gentes lib. 3.* saith, *it is in the power of free-will to hinder or not hinder the receiving of divine grace. Molina* again telleth *that the perseverance of men in good, dependeth upon their own co-operation with grace.* By grace they mean no more but a moral suasion externally offered, or an objective inclination of the will, but no effectual determination at all. So indeed at the command of the will, grace is either useful or not, permitted to enter in or shut out of doors. Who perceiveth not this doctrine to be derogatory to the honor of GOD and power of free grace? Therefore we say with *Augustin in his Ench. cap. 32. DEUS nolentem praevenit ut velit, volentem sequitur ne frustra velit. The Lord, by his grace maketh willing men willing, and willing men are assisted by the same, lest they runne in vain. The will of man* (saith he, who

was

was the hammer of *Pelagianism*) *is liberâ quia liberata. Its free because its freed.* See *Aug. de fide ad Petrum Diaconum, cap.* 32. *Firmissime tene & nullatenus dubites posse quidem hominem, quem nec ignorantia literarum, nec aliqua prohibet imbecillitas, vel adversitas, verba sanctæ Legis & Evangelii sive legere, sive ex ore cujuscunque prædicatoris audire, sed ut quod audit percipiat etiam corde & mandata DEI facere velit, nemo potest, nisi quem DEUS gratia sua prævenerit, data divinitus bona voluntate atque virtute.* i. e. *Hold thou it most firmly, and no wayes doubt, that a man whom neither ignorance of good letters, nor any infirmity or adversity doth hinder, hath power both to read the words of the holy Law and Gospel, and to hear them from the mouth of the Preacher, but to take up and receive in his heart what he heareth, and to be willing to do the Commandments of GOD, no man is able but he whom GOD hath prevevened by his grace, having given to him good will and vertue. Aug. lib.* 1. *contra duas epist. Pel. cap.* 19. *Christus non dicit, nemo potest venire ad filium nisi Pater duxerit, ut illic aliquo modo intelligamus præsidere voluntatem, sed dicit (traxerit) quis autem trahitur (si jam volebat, & tamen nemo venit nisi velit, trahitur ergo miris modis, ut velit, ab illo qui novit in ipsis hominum cordibus*

operari

operari nonnt homines, quod fieri non potest, nolentes credant, sed ut volentes ex nolentibus fiant, i.e. Christ doth not say, no man can come to the Son except the Father lead him, that then in some measure we should think the will of man to preceed, but he saith, (except the father draw him) but who is drawn who before was willing, and no man comes except he be willing, therefore man is drawn in a wonderful manner, that he is willing, even by him who knoweth to work in the verie hearts of men inwardly, not that men (which is impossible) should believe not willing, but that of men nilling they should become willing. Moreover, we have need of grace to keep grace and continue in it. *Hierom ad Crestiphontem* hath an excellent saying, *non sufficit mihi*, saith he, *quod semel donaverit gratiam nisi semper donaverit*. i. e. I will not be satisfied to get the first grace, unless I get a constant tack of it. How cõtrar is this to the doctrine of Jesuits the Reader may consider, who indeed give more to the will of man, then to the grace of GOD. If *Tertullian* be judge, this will be found in them a heresie, for *adversus haereses*, he saith, true faith dictateth this in defending the true GOD, and whatsoever is his, we make it only his: for he will be co-partner with none in these workes: as with-

 out

out him we can do nothing, so it is he who worketh in us to will and to do of his good pleasure. For further knowledge of *Jansenius* tenets I will here set them down. The *Jansenists, Dominicans, Augustines*, and most of the *Gallican Church*, do follow the doctrine of *Augustin*, about free grace, and maintain these five propositions.

1 First, *Aliqua DEI præcepta, hominibus justis volentibus, & conantibus secundum præsentes quas habent vires, sunt impossibilia, deest quoque iis gratia, qua possibilia fiant.* So they say, that the gracious cannot fulfil the whole law, but have need of a Saviour.

2 Secondly, *Interiori gratiæ, in statu naturæ lapsæ, nunquam resistitur.* Men may resist external means, but efficacious grace is prevalent.

3 Thirdly, *Ad merendum & demerendum in statu naturæ lapsæ, non requiritur in homine libertas a necessitate, sed sufficit libertas à coactione.* The Lord may draw a man freely to his duty, yet necessarily.

4 Fourthly, *Semi-Pelagiani admittebant prævenientis gratiæ interioris necessitatem ad singulos actus, etiam ad initium fidei; & in hoc erant hæretici, quod vellent eam gratiam talem esse, cui posset voluntas humana resistere, vel obtemperare.* By this all the Jesuits

Jesuits are heretical, who defend the victorie of the will over free grace.

Fifthly, *Semi-Pelagianorum error est dicere Christum pro omnibus omnino hominibus mortuum esse, aut sanguinem fudisse.* 5

Their Propositions were judged and condemned at *Rome* by Pope *Innocent* the tenth. Albeit he professed himself not to be versed in these matters, being no Divine but a Canonist. † The Ambassadours from the *Gallican Churches* reasoned most earnestly for them, and held forth clearly that this was the tenet of *Augustin*, and all Catholick Doctors except the Jesuits. Yet notwithstanding, *anno* 1653. the *Bull* came forth against the efficacy of grace, and all the followers of *Augustin*, the tenour whereof followeth.

† *Non sum Theologus, said the Rabbi. sed Canonista.*

Primam, *Praedictarum propositionum aliqua DEI praecepta hominibus justis volentibus, conantibus secundum praesentes quas habent vires, sunt impossibilia; deest quoque illis gratia qua possibilia fiant, temerariam impiam blasphemam anathemate damnatam, Haereticam declaramus, & ut talem damnamus.*

Secundam, *Interiori gratiae in statu naturae lapsae nunquam resistitur, Haereticam declaramus, & ut talem damnamus.*

Tertiam, *Ad merendum & demerendum, in statu naturae lapsae non requiritur in homi-*

ut libertas à necessitate, sed libertas à coactione sufficit: Hæreticam declaramus, & ut talem damnamus.

Quartam, *Semi-Pelagiani admittebant, prævenientis gratiæ interioris necessitatem, ad singulos actus, etiam ad initium fidei, & in hoc erant hæretici quod vellent eam gratiam talem esse, cui posset voluntas humana resistere, vel obtemperare, falsam, & hæreticam declaramus, & ut talem damnamus.*

Quintam, *Semi-Pelagianum est, dicere Christum pro omnibus omnino hominibus mortuum fuisse, & sanguinem fudisse, falsam, temerariam, scandalosam, & intellectam eo sensu, ut Christus pro salute duntaxat prædestinatorum mortuus sit, impiam, blasphemiam, contumeliosam, Divinæ pietati derogantem, hæreticam declaramus & ut talem damnamus.*

Hence it appeareth that the present *Papal Church*, is contrat to the Doctrine of *Augustin*, &c. is a condemner of all the *Dominicans*, *Jansenists*, *Sorbonists*, and of the Doctrine of free and efficacious grace, making the will umpire in all these matters, and owneth the tenets of the *Molinists* only. And that since the Council of *Trent* it is not what it was formerly: therefore erroneous then or now, so not infallible. When the *Bull* was proclaimed, the Commissioners from

from the *Gallican Churches* determined amongst themselves, that if they were required to subscribe the Popes sentence, they would rather suffer then subscribe it, except in their own sense. i. e. *Excepting and securing the grace of Jesus Christ, effectual by it self, necessar to all actions of piety.* And by this it appeareth that they could not judge him infallible *in Cathedra.* And beside many at *Rome* and in *Flanders* cryed down the decree, and spoke often of the necessitie of a Counsil seeing the doctrine of free grace was impeached, and *Pelagianism* brought into the *Church of Rome.* It must be evident therefore, that *Pelagianism* and *Semi-Pelagianism* being the main ingredients in the doctrinals of *Rome*, concerning grace, they do frustrate the grace of GOD, *Gal.* 2. 21. and give the victory over it to the will of man in all cases. How gracious a Papist keeping these principles can be, let the Reader judge, and how numerous their Party is, it is easily known.

At the same time the Pope condemned a book called *the Houres*, Printed at *Paris*, and commended by the *French Divines*, because efficacious grace was there mentioned; and the second Command was translated thus, *Te shal not make an Idol, or graven Image to adore them.* When one of the Commissioners

Commissioners from the *Gallican Churches* did complain upon the sentence of the Pope, against a book so generally approved in *France*. *Mr. Albizzi* the Popes Secretary said, that the translation was one with that of *Geneva*, and what ever Schollars might conceive of it, the People would readily mistake it, and not fall down before the Images. One of the Commissioners answered, that this Doctrine would be also valid against the translation of Scripture, for the second Command behoved to be thus translated, he answered, that the Pope was not obliedged to hear Parties, and answere reasons, and the Gospel were not the Gospel, if the *Pope* did not approve it. This is high-language, yet the Court strain at *Rome*. Yea, the operation of grace is heresie, if he call it so. See more of this in the *Journal of St. de Cenour*, concerning the five Propositions, who with other Commissioners from the *Gallican Churches* relate this.

Fifthteenthly, You lay too much
§ 15 Inst. stress on the work wrought, as *Satisfactory Penuance, Extream Unction, the telling over of Prayers, the outward receit of Sacraments, Bodily Austerities, &c.* And put these in stead of Regeneration, so necessar for each Christian, and of inward duties which have the promise chiefly, terming all such phanatick

natick, whereas Scripture ſaith, *Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot ſee God.* Iohn 3, 3. *And, except ye be converted and become as little children, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of Heaven, Matth,* 18 3. *and bodily exerciſe profiteth little,* 1. *Tim.* 4. 8. Duties rightly done are well worth their own room, but to turn us back under the Goſpel to the Covenant of workes, is a faſcination, and making voide of the grace of GOD, *Gal.* 2. 21. *Gal.* 3. 2 and this errour leadeth you to condemn Infants unbaptized for the want of that work wrought, whereas the promiſe is to us and to our children, *Act.* 2. 39. and we have all freely, not by merit.

Reply, *You calumniat us here again, Papiſt ſaying, that we put bodily auſterities in the* Reply. *place of Regeneration, wherein you contradict your ſelf, granting that we hold Baptiſmal Regeneration abſolutly neceſſar: ſo that a man cannot be ſaved without it, according to the clear words of St.* Iohn 3. 5. *How then can you ſay that we hold bodily auſteritie inſtead of Regeneration? How can Miniſters be ſo carnal or ſenſual, as to ſpeak, againſt bodily auſteritie. Which Chriſt coming into this world, did eho ſe, ſaith the devout* St. Bernard, *concluding that either licentious men in a world are deceived, who*

chooſe

choose them not, or else Christ. Serm. de nativ. *But as for the* work wrought, *it seemeth you understand it not, when you ascribe it to the telling over of Prayers, for it hath no place but in the Sacraments: which of themselves work grace, either in these that cannot work, or put a stop, as Infants or others. And when you say, the promise is made to us and to our children,* Acts 2. 39. *Either you must acknowledge your self a Jew, and to be of the seed of* Abraham *according to the flesh, or else with the Apostle and Catholick Church. In the same place, say, We are made the children of* Abraham *by Baptism and Regeration, as verse* 24. *and* 41. *proves.*

Protestants Duply.

Duply, That which I said ye grant viz. the receit of Baptism, *ex opere operato,* to Regenerat, but with a restriction to *Infants.* By which evasion it seemeth ye understand not well your own tenets, for the Council of *Trent Sess.* 7. *Can.* 7. & 8. speaketh otherwise, they anathematize them who deny, that *Sacramenta nova legis conferunt gratiam ex opere operato semper & omnibus non aliquando, & aliquibus.* So they speak of all the Sacraments of the New Testament and not only of Baptism: and if they limited it to *Infants,* it could not be *omnibus* but *aliquibus* only. And *Bellarmin* who understood Popery leaveth you alone here, for

for *lib.* 1. *cap.* 12. *de Sacram. Bapt.* he ſaith, Baptiſm *ex opere operato confert gratiam, quavere & formaliter juſtificatur homo:* Then he is not ſpeaking of Children. If it be ſo, all Baptized are Regenerated immediatly, even your *Indians*, whom ye drive by droves to the font-ſtone, and turning from Heathniſm is true Converſion. Yea, all baptized are ſaved and none of them damned, this is indeed an eaſy way to Heaven. That place *John* 3. is not chiefly meaned of Baptiſm, otherwiſe all unbaptized perſons ſhould be damned, which is not true, and they who ſay ſo are cruel to Infants. And wherein I pray you do I contradict my ſelf here? Seeing your external Regeneration is not that Scripture one meaned, *John* 3. and *Matth.* 18. and 2. *Cor.* 5. 17. If all ſuch be new creatures, we have none in the viſible Church, come to years, but converts, new creatures, regenerated ones born again; and can you ſay ſo, without a bluſh? I mean by the *ſeed of Abraham, the heirs of promiſe*, with the Apoſtle *Gal.* 3. 29. What you challenge in this I do not underſtand, and I doubt if you underſtand your ſelf: for the bleſſing of *Abraham* belongeth to us Gentiles as well as to the Jews. Bodily auſterities for mortifying ſenſual corruption I did approve, if they be put in their own;

place. So you fight with your own shaddow here, We are for fasting, bumble-walking, and all the acts of Scripture-self-denyal, we hold commanded duties for mortification, such as fastings, &c. to be very useful for holding the body in subjection, and for subduing sensualitie. Secondly, we deny not but the Lord will in fatherly wrath chasten his children here for their sins, as he did *Israel* in the wilderness, *Moses*, *David*, *Iehoshaphat* & many moe, according to that *Amos* 3. 2. Thirdly, this chastisement, whither voluntar or not, is not satisfaction to divine justice, nor proper penaltie of the law, because the satisfaction of Iesus Christ is compleatly perfect, but it could not be so if any satisfaction were laid on us, see *Dallæus* † who hath a learned Treatise concerning this truth. Fourthly, If we cannot satisfie, we merit nothing that is good at the hands of GOD, but must say with *Bernard on Cant. Serm. 61. Misericordia tua, merita nostra Domine*; *thy mercy O Lord is our merits*. Salvation, deliverance, Heaven, happiness, and all our well-fare is of the Lord. We get these, *gratis*. The Papists may be ashamed to tell the world of *congruous merits* before Conversion, of *commutative justice*, betwixt GOD and man by the dignity of their workes after conversion, and their refusing

† *Dallæus de satisfactione.*

fuſing to have Heaven *gratis*. *Andradius* the interpreter of the Council of *Trent*, *Orthod. explic. lib. 6.* ſaith, *The reward of the juſt is not freely given, but Heaven is ſet to the ſale for our workes.* *Tapperus* ſaith in *Explic. art. Lovan. tom. 2. art. 9. GOD forbid that the juſt ſhould expect eternal life as the poor man doth his almes, it is our conqueſt, our triumph, and the prize due to our labours.* *Valentia tom. 3. diſp. 7.* telleth, *that the workes of the faithfull, are ſatisfactory for the puniſhment of ſin.* *Bellarmin* bringeth forth a new evaſion, *de juſtif. lib. 5. cap. 10.* ſaying, *that Chriſt merited, that we ſhould merit.* So that the merit of our workes is from his merits; this is plaiſter to daub with. For where do we read in Scripture that phraſe? He hath ſuffered for us that we ſhould be holy in all manner of Converſation, and ſerve him in righteouſneſs and holineſs, but no where that we ſhould merit eternal life, the gift is wholly from him, ſo it is written, *Rom. 6. 23.* Secondly, This is *petitio principii*, for the queſtion betwixt Papiſts and us, is, whither we are unprofitable ſervants when we have done all? So ſpeak we with Scripture, they ſay we are meritorious men. Thirdly, *Suarez* ſaith, *Tom. 1. in Thomam diſp. 4.* another thing, *that good workes are in themſelves and*

of their own nature meritorious, therefore not such, because of Christ his merits. Otherwise saith he, we could not be said to merit. We say, this is the way to elipe the satisfaction of Christ Jesus, & the value of the price payed for us. What good workes we do are mixed with imperfections, and are too few, alas, if the Lord accept of them, and reward these workes with temporal or spiritual blessings, it is not for the merit of the work, but of free grace and mercy, and for the merits of Christ meerly. So we may be freely rewarded; see *Matth.* 5. 46. *Luk.* 6. 32. where the word χαρις and μισθος are promiscuously taken. We cannot make amends to GOD nor satisfie his justice, but his promise is sure, not according to our merits, but his own mercy: so we must inherit eternal life, this is *Aug.* doctrine on *Ps.* 88. and *Chrysost.* on *Col.* 2. Your satisfactions and merits are contrar to Scripture, pure antiquity, dishonourable to Jesus Christ, and prejudicial to souls. Now you see this reflection might have been well spared, for it is no reply at all to what I said.

§ 16. *Inst.* Sixteenthly, Ye foster lootnes and prophaines by telling tales about Purgatory, the use of prayer and sacrifices for the dead. But the Scripture saith *Heb.* 9. 27. after death cometh judgement, which must be understood

understood immediatly, otherwise it might be said after birth cometh judgement, and in the grave there is neither work nor invention; neither is there any place appointed for people after their removal hence, save Heaven or hell.

Reply, *The telling of men that after their sins are forgiven, they must suffer for the temporal pain due to them, is not a way to foster looseſs, but rather to terrifie all who believe from offending GOD in the least, seeing all such must be chastised, either by GOD punishing, or man doing pennance, and that voluntary, either here, or in Purgatory hereafter, according to the Apostle* 1. Cor. 3. 15. If any ones work burn, he shal suffer loss, but he shal be saved, yet so as by fire, *which place* Augustin *citing on* Ps. 37. *saith*, and because it is said, he shal be saved, that fire is contemned, yet that fire shal be more grievous then what ever a man can suffer in this life. Purge me O Lord and make me such a one as shal not need that mending fire, &c. *Now doth* St. Paul *or* Aug. *here tell tales? Or can that mending fire by which a man is saved, be more grievous then what he can suffer here? Or can it make a man loose to pray with* Aug. *thus? But it may be he was doting here, as when he said Mass for his Mothers soul, as we read in his* Confessions

Papist Reply.

Confessions, *committing both sacriledge and Idolatrie, (as commonly* Protestants *say) to please an old wife after her death.* You adde that Scripture saith, after death cometh judgement, and in the grave there be neither work nor invention. *What maketh this against Purgatory? Do Catholicks deny that we are justified at the very moment of death before they go to Purgatory? Or that they work in the grave. But how is it true say you,* there is no place mentioned in Scripture save Heaven or hell, to which the godly and wicked do go? *Albeit all go to one of these places, yet is there not a prison mentioned, from which a man shal not go till he hath payed the uttermost farthing,* Matth. 5. 25. *which the Fathers expounded to be Purgatory,* viz. Hierom on this chapter, St. Cyp. ep. 52. Tertull. lib. de anima. *and doth not* St. Paul *above cited, speak of another fire then that of hell?*

Protestants Duply.

Duply, You have Rhetorications in defence of Purgatory, which I pass, and touch reason or testimonie produced by you. You mention two texts of Scripture, the one is *Matth.* 5. 25. where we are commanded to agree with our adversarie quickly, &c. this place proveth no Purgatory prison. For first, It is allegorick, and so cannot be argumentative, on a controverted point. All that

is

is here intended, it, that brethren ſhould dwel together in love, and forgive other their treſpaſſes againſt them, as is clear from the context. Secondly, If it were meaned of Purgatory, it would make the Lord their adverſarie, they behoved to be delivered up to the Devil, for he is the Jaylor of the priſon: Now it is ſtrange divinity to ſay that the Lord is an adverſary, and the Devil a Jaylor, to the man whoſe ſins are forgiven him. Thirdly, If this priſon be Purgatory, then there is commutative juſtice betwixt GOD and man, for ſuch here pay the uttermoſt farthing. And who can ſay to the Lord, *forgive me, have mercy upon me*, and yet be of this judgement, that he can pay all his debt by that mending fire, and not owe any thing to free gracious pardon?

Fourthly, It maketh puniſhment to purge away puniſhment, which is *Repugnantia in adjecto*. For you grant that the filth and blot of ſin is removed here. Your own *Janſenius* interpreteth it not of Purgatory, *Concor. in locum*. The other Scripture is 1. *Cor.* 3. *We ſhall be ſaved yet ſo as by fire*, that is not meaned of purgatorie fire, but of probatorie fire in this life, not hereafter. Let any man read the chapeer, and he will ſee this the purpoſe of the *Holy Ghoſt*, to ſhew what was doctrinally or practically erroneous

ſhould

should be put to the firie tryall, when judgment should begin at the house of God, as the Apostle *Peter* speaketh, 1. *Pet.* 4. 17. your own *Pererius* interpreteth not this place 1. *Cor.* 3. of purgatorie.

You say Ancients interpret these Scriptures, so namely *Augustin*, *Tertullian*, *Hierom*, *Cyprian*. I would first enquire at you, how you can cite the Commentars of any privat men on Scripture? Seeing you averre before confidently, that the sensing of Scripture and interpretation thereof belongeth to the Church of *Rome*, and to no privat persons, *Augustin*, *Cyprian*, &c. were not the Church of *Rome*, but privat Doctours. Yea, they were never members of this Church as it is now constituted, being great strangers to *supream infallibility and universal Monarchy engrossed in the person of the Pope*. They lived in *Africk*, the one at *Hippo*, the other at *Carthage*, and were Bishops there. *Tertullian* was a Presbyter, and forced to leave *Rome* for the aspersions cast upon him, by some envyous Doctors there; which was the first thing tempted him to *Montanism*, as it is told in his life; he was formerly free of it. When you interpret Scripture, you are bound to bring one of the Popes decretals, or a Canon authorised by him for the meaning of a text, otherwise you are inconsistent

sistent with your own opinion. But that which now you bring from these ancients, is as I conceive fully satisfied and explained in the eight Duply, to which I referre the Reader. You bring back hither and thither with your impertinencies. All you have to do here if you would keep rule, is to answer Scripture arguments, seeing these taken from antiquitie have been debated formerly in their own toom. Yet to tell *Augustines* mind about the sense of the 1. *Cor.* 3. it is not so as you cite it, he thinketh the text hard and difficult, but doth not build Purgatory on it, he is in that at a stand what to say, and will not define the interpretation, but modestly thus, *Non ideo confirmo, quoniam non refello, Aug. de Civit. DEI. lib.* 21. *cap.* 24. *Tertullian* is so far from it, that he saith *lib. de Patientia, Christum ledimus, &c. We wrong Jesus Christ, if we shal say, that those who have their sins forgiven, are in a state to be pitied.* But in Purgatory if the suffering be so great, they are to be pitied. *Cyprian de mortalitate*, is of the same mind, all who are in Christ, when they go hence reign with Christ. *Ejus est mortem timere qui ad Christum nolit ire: Let him fear death who will not go to Christ.* You say, these in Purgatory are in Christ, then saith *Cyprian*, they go to Christ not to Purgatory,

Justin Martyr saith, *that immediatly after death the souls of the righteous go to Paradise, and of the unrighteous to hell, resp. ad Orthod. quæst.* When you would have them then holding Purgatory, you bring them under contradiction, and are bound to reconcile them with themselves; for any such clashings you may thank your *Index Expurgatorius*. The Fathers indeed speak of probatory mending fire here, of *loca refrigerii* before the Resurrection, of *Fluvius ignens* after it, this is the opinion of some. Hence ariseth your citations, but for Purgatory they knew it not. It is the Blood of Jesus Christ which taketh away the guilt and filth of sin. Now that this erroneous opinion maketh men loose, reason proveth it. For men who believe that they may live loosely here, and yet go to heaven, are tempted to prophainess, *ipso facto*, whatever be pretended to the contrar; especially when it is told them withall, that some Soul-Masses for a little money may be had to free them quickly thence. And our experience in this land maketh it out also, because many loose livers hanker after Poperie, and hate to be reformed. You answere just nothing to the 9. *Heb.* for if judgement cometh immediatly after death, where is Purgatorie then? That judgement is not temporane but eternall

nall, it is one with *Eccl.* 11. 9. And I would gladly know, if this Tenet can hold with that ſcripture *Rev.* 14. 13. *They who die in the Lord reſt from their labours.* And if ſo they are not puniſhed henceforth. This purgatory fire of your own kindling, maketh a hot kitchin to the Pope, but purgeth no ſoul at all. For Purgatory was not decreed to be *de fide*, till the Counſill of *Lateran*, under *Innocent* the 3. the *Florentine* under *Eugenius* the 4. and the *Tridentine* under *Pius* the 4. ſo it is not old. Many of the Fathers ſuppoſed that the ſaints received not full reward till the reſurrection. *Aug.* though dubious about it elſe where, yet in one place, *De verbis Apoſtoli*, *ſerm.* 18. ſayeth, *There be two places, there is not a third, we are ignorant of a third* (meaning Purgatorie,) *yea we find in ſcripture that there is none ſuch.* In the Greek Fathers there is no mention of it ſaith *Roſſenſis.* And whereas it is objected, that *Auguſtin* ſaid Maſſe for his mother *Monica.* He ſayeth only, that ſeeing ſhe prayed ſo frequently for him, he was bound to ſend his beſt wiſhes after her, if they could avail. But ſpeaketh very doubtfully of the matter in his book *de civit. DEI.* Beſide the Ancients prayed for theſe whom they thought to be in *Abrahams* boſom, for a joyful Reſurrection and full fruition to them. The

Prayer for the Dead.

prayers of the Romanists are for men in misene, prisons, in a place next to hell. So the one and other differ much. But the matter is, that your gold groweth here, it is your livelyhood, your *Mexico*, this maketh you so contend for it.

§ 17 *Inst.* Seventeenthly, Ye commit murther and allow it contrar to the sixt Command, witnes the Massacre at *Paris*, commended by the popish Oratour *Muretus*, whose book is Printed by authority?

Papists Reply. Reply, *The testimonie of a privat Oratour, doth not make the articles of our faith. And if this fact was done by privat Animosities, neither Religion nor reason can allow it. Nor do any Catholicks approve it, except they who think it was done by the Kings authority, to punish rebellious subjects whom he could not otherwise crub.*

Protestants Duply. *Duply*, This Oration of *Muretus* wherein he commendeth the Massacre, is licensed, and Printed by authority, so it is not the meer testimonie of a privat Oratour, but publickly allowed. And whereas you say, *that no Catholicks approve it, except these who think it was done by the Kings authority.* I answer, the fact was, clearly murther, a breach of the sixth Command, and admit the French King who then was young had consented to it, will that justifie the breach of.

of a divine precept? How can that consist with *Acts* 4. 19. I am bound actively to obey my Superiours in the Lord, *ad aras*, religion, reason, craves no more. Your own *Thuanus* hath not this poor evasion for justifying this murther, but calleth it a bloody barbarous fact to murther men living peaceably. And that universal flux of blood which flowed so abundantly from all the passages of that young King at his death, proclaimeth more lowdly to the world the unlawfulness of it, nor all the Rhetorick of *Mureins* can wipe off. For as an excellent Poet saith on that subject,

Naribus, ore, oculis, atque auribus undique
& ano,
Et pene trumpit qui tuus iste cruor,
Non tuus iste cruor, sanctorum at cede cruorem,
Quem ferus hausisti, non poterat, coquere.

Eighteenthly, Ye call your selves the Universal Church, which was never attributed to the Church of Rome in the Apostle *Paul* his time; notwithstanding that then their faith was spoken of throughall the world *Rom.* 1. 8. Beside ye are but a particular Church at best, not so numerous as we and the Greek Church are, with whom we joyn in one Confession, except about the manner of the Processió of the *Holy Ghost*. As witnesseth

§ 18. *Inst.*

th eir

their Confession set forth in the name of the *Greek Church*, by *Cyrillus* Patriarch of *Cõstantinople*, and printed *Anno* 1633. which booke can easily be produced. Whereas ye bragge of Unity, ye are great Schismaticks, renting the universall Church, and taking the title from them to your selves. Ye are miserably divided within, as appeareth from the strong factions of the Councill of *Trent*, and these hot skirmishes amongst *Jesuits Dominicans*, and *Jansenists* lasting to this day. Moreover, the Scripture calleth *Rome*, *Babylon*, the scarlet whore, according to your own Interpreters upon *Rev.* 17. 18. which *Babylon* is to be destroyed.

Papists Reply.

Reply, *You accuse us for calling our selves the Universal Church, and yet would willingly take that title to your selves, if the common practise in all Ages, to your shame and discredit did not oppose it. None acknowledging your Church under this title, but all generally ours. But I have heretofore told you why the* Roman Church *is called the* Catholick, *as being the* Mother Church *constantly since the Apostles times, which hath a power of head-ship and jurisdiction over all the rest, holding communion with her through out the world. Then you say*, we are but a particular Church, not so numerous as ye and the Grecians, with whom ye joyn in one

Confession

Confeſſion of Faith, except about the manner of the proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt. *Which it ſeemeth you hold but as a triſſle, although it maketh no diſtinction betwixt the ſecond and the third Perſon of the Trinity; for where there is no Proceſſion and relative oppoſition in the Trinitie, there is no diſtinction* ſay Divines *after* Iohn Damaſcene, *yet notwithſtanding, ye joine with this in the confeſſion of faith, albeit they plainly diſclaim them, in the cenſure of the* Orientall Church, *where* chap. 7. 12. 13. 21. *they hold* Tranſubſtantiation, ſeven Sacraments, an unbloody ſacrifice, prayers to the ſaints, and for the dead, *whatever you alleadge of that confeſſion of faith printed only in the laſt year. But however, this ſheweth the Proteſtants weakneſs, and wavering faith, that they claim the* Grecians *and* Lutherians, *albeit both do openly diſclaim them. Neither do you prove better our diviſion amongſt our ſelves, ſeing all the parties in the Council of* Trent, *ſubſcrived the Canons thereof, nor doth the hot skirmiſhes betwixt* Jeſuits *and* Dominicans *in ſchool queſtions, hinder their Unity in all the tenets of the Catholick Church, both being willing to ſubſcribe them with their blood, as amongſt Jeſuits many do to this day. As for* Janſeniſts *we altogether diſowne them, and to make you more numerous, if ye pleaſe, are well con-*

tent

tent that in many things you call them yours. I am content also Rome be called the scarlet whore, Rev. 17. 18. *viz. Rome under Pagan Empe ours. But was not the Church of Rome then in her greatest integrity and virginity, under the Apostles* St. Peter *and* Paul, *who praising her faith as spoken of through the world, both declare her universality, and speak of her preheminence.*

Protestants Duply.

Duply, I had reason to challenge your usurpation of the Catholick title, for your own *Pighius Eccl. hierarch. lib. 6. cap.* 3. saith, *Quis unquam per Romanam Ecclesiam, intellexit universalem?* He thinketh it absurd and repugnant, and so it is. As for the *Grecians* I can presently produce their Confession, † Printed not the last year, but 30. years ago and upward, wherein they disclaim *seven Sacraments, the unbloody service of the Masse, prayers to Saints, or for the Dead, Purgatory, Transubstantiation, &c.* And *Dr. Rivet* in his 3. *Tom. pag.* 1257. setteth down at length, how the Jesuits by money and moyen of the French Ambassadour, accused the same *Cyrillus* of treason before the grand *Segniour*, and said, that he favoured the *King of great* BRITTAIN: by which accusation he was for a time thrust out of charge, and forced to flee *anno* 1627. but afterwards by the good providence of GOD restored

† *See it set down after the Preface.*

restored, the *Greek Church* would owne no other Patriarch during his absence, and how sore he was persecuted thereafter, see *Horneck* in his *Summa Contro.* As for the *Jansenists* you gift us with them, calling them ours. So *Augustin* and the *Dominicans* are ours also in this, so your unity and universality is not so much as you pretend. You grant also that the scarlet whore, *Rev.* 17. and *Babylon* is *Rome*, but under the Heathen Emperours, and not as it is now under the Pope. Your own *Ribera* refuteth you fully in this, for he saith † that it must be meaned of Apostat Rome in the time of *Antichrist*, because she is called *an adulteress*, *the mother of harlots*, but there can be no adultery, where Marriage was not once. Secondly, The people of GOD are required to leave her lest they partake of her plagues. But they were never incorporated with Pagan Rome as Christians, for they had no communion with Pagan Idols, *Ergo*, if your Church be the Mother of Fornications, and less numerous then these who hold the Scripture for the rule, in no sense can ye be called the Catholick Church.

† *So saith Sixtus Senensis, and Baronius also.*

Ninthreenthly, Ye make the Pope Christs Vicar on Earth, *Peters* successour, the head of the Church, an infallible man, a *Demi-God*. Whereas all the Apostles were equal

§ 19. *Inst.*

in power and dignity, *Matth.* 20. 26. And *Cyprian lib.* 3. *de unitate Ecclesiæ*, saith, *hoc idem Petrus quod reliqui Apostoli, pares consortio, & dignitate. Peter* was one with the rest of the Apostles in dignity and fellowship. *Ambros. de Sp. S. lib.* 2. *cap.* ult. *Nec Paulus est inferior Petro.* See *August. ad Hieron epist.* 97. and *Hierom ad Evagr.* and *Cyprian epist. ad Quintum* (71.) Prophets and Apostles were not infallible except in penning the Scripture. Did not *Moses* speak unadvisedly *Psalm.* 106. 33. the Prophet *Elisha* professeth that the case of the *Shunamit* was hid from him, 2. *Kings* 4. 27. *Nathan* gave forth a verdict to day, and made a retractation to morrow, 2. *Sam.* 7. *Peter* controuled the Heavenly vision, and knew not what to do *Acts* 10. 17. And shall your sinfull Popes then be infallible, who will believe it? Is it not then lamentable, that ye resolve your faith into humane testimony, yea, into that which is a very lie, the Popes infallibility? Were it not safer to make Scripture your ground, then to build upon this sandie foundation, and so fasten your selves incurably into errour?

Papist Reply. Reply, *You runne out upon the Popes titles, till in the end you make him a Demi-God, imputing this as that by way of calumny to us.* Whereas all the Apostles were equal

equal in power and dignity, *say you*, Matth. 20. 26, *Where Christ only forbiddeth spiritual Superiours, to exercise that power with pride and tyranny, as did the Princes of the Gentiles, but with humility and meekness as himself did. Yet he there expresseth a greater and a lesser, a superiour and inferiour amongst them, as he saith more clearly in* Luke 22. 26. he that is amongst you greatest, let him be as the lesser, and he who is chief as he who would serve them. *You cite* Cyprian, *saying*, the Apostles were equal in dignity, *but supposing the following words*, that Christ disposed the order of unity; beginning with Peter, *whom in his* epist. ad Julianum, *he calleth*, both head and root of his Church. *All that followeth is*, that Moses spoke unadvisedly, the Propher Elisha was ignorant of some things, the Propher Nathan made a retractation, and St. Peter controuled the Heavenly vision. *To shew the Prophets and Apostles were not infallible, save in penning the Scripture, and so that the Pope is not such. This is but a vain rapsodie, to colour your own unsetled belief and contradiction in doctrine, but nothing against us. For suppose they had erred in these things that concerned not their doctrine, all that you can inferre by comparison is, that the Pope may erre in the like. But as in penning the word of*

GOD they were infallible, were they not also in preaching of it? Or is not the high Bishop in all Councils as in the representative Church, infallible in subscribing, approving, and confirming her decrees? If the same decrees of the Council be infallible. So but when you deny the Pope as head, with the Bishops in general Councils as chief members to be infallible, you deny the infallibility of the Church, which I have sufficiently shewed, reflecting on your sixth Answer.

Protestants Duply.

Duply. You labour to prove imparity amongst the Apostles from *Luke* 22. 26. and would have us to believe that the *Papal Monarchy* is there; which is like the consequents of *Mr. Vaux* in his Catechism, *proving Image worship from the second Command.* For it is clear from verse 30. that albeit Kingly government was in the state, yet it should not be so in the Church. And that tyranie is not the only thing forbidden here, appeareth from this, that somewhat is interdicted to Church-men, which is granted to others, but tyranny is licensed to none. Compare *Matth.* 20. 25. with *Luke* 22. 25. κατακυριευουσιν in the one place is expressed by μειζονα in the other. Then it is not only inhibited here. Beside, the 20. *Matth.* which you call unclear is most clear, *he that will be greatest*, seeking to exalt himself, *shall*

be

be least, for he shal be abased. And he who is called greatest in *Luke* 22. is opposed to the *youngest*, the word is μειζων in the verse. So by this opposition, *the greatest*, is the eldest of the greatest in gifts, who should be humble, self-denyed Ministers, as if they were not so priviledged. See 1. *Peter* 5. 3. To the place of *Cyprian* cited, ye answer nothing. Only you alleage that I suppress what followeth, & in stead of the citation you take your self to another place *ad Julianum*, where he calleth Peter *first in order*, and this we do not deny. But what will that make for his visible Monarchy? For sure I am, *die Ecclesiæ*, *Matth.* 18. will refute that to the worlds end. This is confirmed by *Cyprians* own practise, for saith he, *Cyprian epist. 6. ad Clerum de cura Paup. Ab initio Episcopatus mei, nihil statui agere, sine consensu cleri & plebis.* See *Cyprian epist. 52. ad Antonium*, and there you will perceive that your Pope is not like *Cornelius* of whom he speaketh, for he was chosen *Clericorum omnium testimonio, & plebis qui adfuit suffragio.* The faithful Martyr was much for peace, unity, and order, and being infested with the *Novatians* he saith, *inde sunt nata schismata, quod sacerdoti DEI non obtemperatur*, and telleth that by way of regrate: But when he writeth to *Cornelius* he calleth him *frater*

and

and no more. Where then was your Popedom? But ye equal your Pope to the Prophets and Apostles who penned the Scripture, which is an odious comparison not worthy of an answer. But forgetting your self you say, *the Pope in the Council*, then it is not the Pope alone, of whose Monarchy we are here speaking, and ridiculously you subjoyn if the Council be infallible, what language is this? *The Pope is infallible in subscribing the decree of a counsel if the Council be infallible*, I say neither of them is infallible, so your faith is resolved into a lie, You would seem to hang the Popes infallibilitie on the sentence of a council; if it be so, the Pope sealing their decrees is infallible accidentally, and relatively not in himself. Others hang the infallibility of the Council on the Pope, to a fallible council may consequently be infallible, and if he ratifie the sentence of a Session, it is all one with an Oecumenick council. All these crotchets are the pillars of your faith, which are wormeaten propper, to which I have spoken formerly in answer to your mentioned reflection.

§ 20 *Answ.*

20. Ye make Christ as many Bodies as their be administrations of the Supper, by that your Transubstantiation. Whereas Scripture giveth him but one natural Body, which

which the Heaven must contain till the restitution of all things *Act.* 3. 21. And we believe in our Creed that he ascended to Heaven, from thence he will come to judge quick and dead. Ye break not the Bread contrar to the Scripture, 1. *Cor.* 10. 16. Yea, ye deny that Bread is there after the consecration, contrar both to sense and reason. And whereas Christ entered within the Vail, not that he should offer himself often. An unbloody sacrifice, expiatory of sin under the Gospel, is contrar to Scripture, *Heb.* 9. 22. *Heb.* 9. 25. *And by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified, Heb.* 10. 14. Ye make as many bodily offerings of Jesus Christ, both for dead and living, as there be Masses.

Reply, *You have many false accusations as formerly, but no witness or warrand. It is to be altogether ignorant of our terms, to say,* that we give Jesus Christ as many Bodies as there be administrations of the Sacrament of the Supper. *For, as we teach one and the same Body, is given in every one of our administrations. So we believe that he ascended to Heaven, that the Heaven containeth him, and from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. But we believe also, that he is really present in the Sacrament, in as many places as it is given in. Which you nor* Papists Reply.

any

any man else cannot shew to imply contradiction, and yet ye delude the people, as if there were an impossibilitie in this? When you say we break not the bread, it seemeth you know not how either the bread is broken or given. Have ye greater decencie, prepare the bread in against greatness, for one man before it be given, for did ye of old cutting it in pieces, about now ye break and bite about. What you say in end, of his once offering himself, in a bloody way on the Crosse, it is true, but if you understand it in an unbloodie manner, & on the Altar, it is false. Otherwise Christ should not be a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedeck, Psalm. 110. Sir, for all these passages of Scripture which you have cited in this your eight Answer, which you see make nothing either against us or for you, look to the Touch-stone of the reformed Gospel, and you will see the Scriptures altogether ours.

Protestants reply.

Reply. You pass over all the scriptures, which I have cited against Christs corporall presence, or bodily offering, with a strong denyall, calling it a calumnie. Sir, is this right reasoning think you? Sure I am, if whole Christ be corporally present in every sacrament, then when it is administred at *Rome, Millan, &c.* there be as many bodies there as sacraments. And by this reason, doe not the words of consecration make Christ

on

on the altar, aswel as by the holy Ghost he was conceived in the womb of the Virgin? And doth not his corporall presence take away his ascension, sitting at the right hand of God and his return? because he is bodily already here. He is a *Priest* for ever, by the infinit vertue of his once offering, which needeth not be repeated, as the Apostle reasoneth well, seeing it is not imperfect, but only applyed by faith, and this is all our salvation. As for the distinction of a bloody, and unbloody offering, it is a device like the rest of your humane inventions. Shew me scripture for it if you can? This you are bound to do at the least, seeing now we are on scripture arguments, and I brought scripture to the contrar. You call it real presence only, I am for real presence, spiritualities are realities. Your tener, if you understand it, is corporal presence. See *Bell. de Euch. lib.* 1. *c.* 2. & 5. the body of Christ is in the sacrament, with the whole magnitude thereof, and that same body which is in heaven is on the altar, either then he must have many bodies, or els one body having magnitude and dimensions, must be in many places at once, in heaven and earth both, which is impossible, seeing it implyeth contradiction. *Theodoret. dial.* 2. *against the Eutichian heresie*, telleth us, that the sacramentall signes change not their na-

ture, but remaine in their own substance and shape. It is said, *Iohn* 6. 56. *He who eateth my flesh shall live by me.* And ye interpret this place of sacramentall eating, *ergo*, all who take the sacrament shall live according to your glosse. Although Christ had a spirituall body after his resurrection, yet he had a true body, because he said to his disciples feel, and see, saith *Aug. ad Dardanum ep.* 57. Now then he hath true dimensions, and when he appeared to the Apostle *Paul* going to *Damascus*, *Aquinas* thinketh, that for the time he left heaven, *Summa q.* 57. And when he came in amongst the Duciples, the doors being shut, *Theodoret* saith, that they made passage for him as their Creator. And the ancient *Hierom* speaketh with the scripture, that the Angel removed the stone from the grave. Although his risen body be glorified, yet it is a real body, and they who are for transubstantiation make it phantastick, without any warrand from the word. For *Bellarmin* acknowledgeth in the foreeited place, that this tenet of corporall presence cannot be clearly proven from scripture, and *lib.* 3. *de Euch. cap.* 19. *Tollitur verborum Domini obscuritas, per patrum consensum.* And *Andradius de cana Domini, Licet transubstantiatio ex scriptura probari nequit tamen fuerit non credere ecclesiæ hoc in re.* And *Scotus*

tus lib. 4 dist. 11. nō extat ullus locus scripturæ cogens nos admittere transubstantiationem sine ecclesiæ declaratione. And addeth that *ante Lateran concilium, non fuit dogma fidei.* Further, this taketh away the suitableness betwixt the sign and thing signified. If transubstantiation be, the bread and wine nourish not the body. How can accidents nourish the body? How can they be without a subject? How Capernaitan like? can reprobats eat the body of Christ? You referre me to the Touchstone, I wish rather you had touched pertinently scripture or reason in your answers, then that you should shift satisfaction to the Reader with a reference to a book, which possibly he cannot find, I have seen that alreadie, and an answere to it printed twelve years ago by *Dr. Guild* who is now at his rest, and his answer is yet unanswered, if you have time it may be worth the while to peruse it for your conviction. Now I beseech you to lay aside interest, prejudice, passion, and weigh again these twenty scripture-arguments, it may please the Lord to discover how Antiscriptural your way is, who knowes what the Lord may do by weak instruments, when his word and truth is on their side.

Question ninth, *But seeing we maintaine the Apostles Creed, why did ye separat from us?* Papists quest. 9.

Protestants Ans. 1. *Answer first*, The Apostles creed, commonly so called, is a notable confession, to which we owe all respect, and do make constant use of it. Yet your own *Lessius de vera fide, in his appendix page* 17. sayeth, that *symbolum Apostolicum* is not sufficient rest for knowing a pure Church. Ye know *Socinians* will say it, who are scarce Christians. It mentioneth nothing to be believed concerning the fall of man, the worke of conversion, the two sacraments which are sealing Ordinances. So it is the whole scripture, which tryeth best Christians and Churches. We did separate because of Idolatrous superstitious worship, by setting up Imagerie, which the Lord hateth, *Deut.* 16. 22.

Ans. 2. Secondly, We separat only from these errours, and cleave to the Scriptures and primitive, pure antiquity.

Ans. 3. Thirdly, We were persecuted, *fugati fuimus non fugimus*, what fire, faggot, bell, book, and candle could do, that we endured before we break off.

Ans. 4. Fourthly, when the light of the Gospel broke up we had a clear call for separation, *Rev.* 18. 4.

Papists Reply. Reply, *In your ninth Answer you say you did cleave to Scripture and pure antiquitie, and only left our errours. You had said better, that you had left Scripture and pure antiquitie, by so doing. For whosoever seperateth*

from the true Church, which Scripture commandeth us to hear, leaveth it. But ye were perſecuted, this I grant of your firſt Apoſtats, Luther for ſacrilege in marrying a Nunne vowed to GOD. Calvin *for* Sodomy *burnt on the ſhoulder,* Knox *for inceſt. And ſo are all knaves, perſecuted by laws. Should they then turne out-laws and rebels.*

Duply, Inſtead of refuting our Reformation, and the reaſons of our ſeparation from Rome, you fal on railing without any reaſon. For *Luther*, *Calvin*, and *Knox* were excellent men of GOD, as their lives and writtings teſtifie. But if your Popes were ſuch, *Platina* hath done them wrong. You may ſay as ſafely, I am brunt on the ſhoulder and I have committed inceſt, there be no more warrand for the one then for the other. And for lawful marriage, I ſee not what divices of men could deny that to any called to it, ſeeing the Lord granteth the liberty. *Stapleton* a vitulent adverſary, yet in this more for the truth then you are, in his preface *ad antidota Evangelica*, ſpeaketh thus of *Calvin*, *Eſt interpres Scripturæ diligens elegans & ſuavis, & Commentarii ejus perutiles ſunt.* He is far from calling him a knave. *Florimond Raymond, de nat. hæreſ. lib. 7. cap. 10.* ſpeaketh thus, *Fatendum eſt Calvinum fuiſſe ingenio admirando acuto & promptiſſimo* *Proteſtants Duply.*

promptissimo in imaginationibus suis, in conceptionibus suis exornatissimo, &c. And for his vindication from these calumnies which you injuriously fixe upon him, read your own *Papyrius Massonius, Elog. par. 2. pag.* 431. where his life is set down, and *Bossecus* refuted who was the authour of these lies. If faithful Historians can have any trust with you, these three worthies whom you labour to blot, were as faithful holy Ministers of the Gospel, as lived in the Church for many hundred years formerly. Your own writters blame your Popes and Clergie men, but they were either Apostats or constant adversaries who blot *Luther* and *Calvin*. It is told by your own that *Pope Sixtus the fourth* licenced the *Cardinal of St. Lucie* and his familie to use freely that sin not to be named, in the three hot moneths of the year. And *Johannes a Casa Arch-Bishop of Beneventum* legat to *Pope Julius the third*, set forth a book in commendation of *Sodomy*, there is more warrand for this report then for the Incest of *Knox*, or Sodomy of *Calvin*. Yet who will delight to rake in such pudles, chaste eares, should abhore such speaches. *Michael* the Arch-Angel brought not in time of dispute, a railing accusation against the Devil; but you spare not to accuse the brethren who are now dead in the Lord, falsely. Is this

the

the right way to promove the truth? *Absit.* But lies being your refuge, I leave you to the GOD of truth for answer, and shal only take notice that you leave all the four grounds of our seperation from *Rome*, unrepealed and intire. So by your silence it appeareth we had reason to leave you, for ye Papists hate to be reformed. †

† *This your own Espencaus regrateth on chap. 1. to Titus.* ¶

Question 10. *What call had your Reformers to go about such a worke?* *Papists qu. 10.*

Answer, They were Ministers lawfully ordained, the Bishops of England and Doctors of *Germany &c.* For *Calvin* he was thrust forth by *Farrel* and *Viret*, and ordained by laying on of the hands of the Presbytry, according to the rule, 1. *Tim.* 4. 14. So was our *Knox*, *Wishhart*, *Willock*, &c. They were like Scribes fitted for the kingdom of God, and furnished with things new and old. And being Officers in an army where they did clearly see the captain of salvation injured, did lift up their voices like trumpets and shew the people their transgressions, which was the duty of their office according to their oath. *Protestants Answer.*

Reply, *Ye take your first Ministerial ordination from the Bishops of England, Doctors of Germany, and hands of the Presbytry, where by Bishops if you understand Catholick Bishops remaining such, you must understand, they neither* *Papists Reply.*

neither could, nor would give any power, to preach against the Catholick Church. No Bishop having power to destruction, but to edification of the Church. As also you must understand, the Catholick Church was yet in her integrity, having lawful Bishops, whom ye should have constantly followed. If Bishops turned Protestants. I ask from whom had they their power, but from the Catholick Church, which no doubt had suspended them in the exercise of their Episcopal function, for their disobedience and separation from her. As for the Doctors of Germany, they might well make Luther a Doctor, but not a lawful Pastor or new Apostle, nor could there be a Presbytrie of pure reformed Ministers to consecrat Calvin, he being the first Reformer himself. For by the word Presbyter, ye understand an Elder in the New Testament, and so by the word Presbytrie you must understand a convention of Elders in the Session, which is the first place indeed for a Sodomist, called for setting him on a pillar, rather then in the Pulpit. But true it is ye had no ordination in the beginning, but every one did preach at his own hand, pretending the goodness of their doctrine, did give them sufficient power and call, as all other Sectaries do commonly in the beginning.

Protestants Duply. Duply, There was a necessity of Reformation

ſtation pleaded for, by many under the Papall tyrrannie. This was denyed, and ſchool queſtions made articles of faith, which cauſed ſome officers of the houſe firſt write againſt them, and preach down ſuch prophane errours, as Indulgencies, &c. Now I ask, if the caſe and exigence be ſuch, whether might not a Popiſh paſtor, by vertue of his ordination, judge himſelf bound in duty to decrie the ſins of the time, and endeavour reformation as *Savanorola* did? eſpecially ſeeing every ordained man is a paſtor of the Catholick Church, this is power for edification not for deſtruction. Admit the Biſhops of England did continue Papall, it was their duty to purifie the worſhip, throw down Idols &c if they were Reformed, then the more fit were they for reforming others. When *Athanaſius* ſeparated from the *Arrians* ceaſed he to be a Biſhop, or was he holden to be ſilent in his apology to the Emperour, he pleadeth for the contrare. Had not the Doctors of Germany power to preach againſt Indulgencies, and were they not Presbyters alſo? You bewray your ignorance concerning *Calvin*, he was not the firſt reformer, *Farrel*, *Viret*, and others were before him, who thruſt him out into the worke of the Lord. You have as little skill of *Presbytry* by taking a Seſſion for it. But it ſeemeth your miſtake hath

been studied to vent your malice against *Calvin*. If ye were as free of superstition and Idolatrie as he was of Sodomy, the offerings of the Lord would not be so injured, nor his Name polluted.

Papists qu. 11. Question eleventh, *Ye want uninterrupted succession, which the primitive Church claimed still, as appeareth from* Aug. contra Cresconium lib. 2. cap. 3. *and* ep. 48. *This was one of the weapons whereby they did beat the* Donatists?

Protestants Answer *Answer*, The ground of separation of the *Donatists*, was the personall vices of men, not the doctrine professed in the Church. For in that they agreed with the universall Church, as is clear from the above mentioned *ep.* Now we did not separat from *Rome*, because their Popes (whom they take for a patron) have been *Atheists*, *Hereticks*, *deniers of the soules immortalitie*, *Whoremongers* &c. as their own writters confess, in the lives of *Silvester* 2. *Alexander* 6. *John* 22. and many moe, but because ye apostatized from the Apostles doctrine and corrupted the worship miserably, so these testimonies concern not us.

Anf. 2. *Secondly*, If interrupted succession make void the Ministry, ye Papists have none at all. For ye often had *Anti-Popes*, and the Councill at *Pisa* deposed two Popes at once,

as

as Hereticks departing from the faith. The Councill of *Constance* deposed *Iohn* 23. *for denying the immortality of the soul and the resurrection*. Behold then your succession, and the infallibility of your Popes. *Eugenius the fourth*, was deposed by the Council of *Basil*; and all the following Popes were his successours, albeit the Council judged *Felix the fifth to be Pope*. Yea further, this place hath vaiked for many years together, so that a line of immediat successours cannot be drawn by your selves.

Thirdly, We have a lawful Ministry, as powerful as the world affordeth, honoured by the blessing of the Lord by begetting soules to himself, and many can from their experience say, that it hath been the power of GOD to their salvation; how then can you challenge our Ministry? Is not this near of kine to that old *Anti-Christian* question proponed to our *Master, by what authority dost thou these things?* And if personal succession had such weight as you say, the Priesthood under the law had been at a great loss. For the line of it was interrupted oftner then once before the coming of Christ, yet he commendeth submission and obedience to them so long as they did sit in *Moses* chair, and no further, *Matth.* 23. 1. So that in Ministers it is the Doctrine and not the Genea- *Ans.* 3.

logy of persons that is so much regarded.

Papists Reply.

Reply, *In your eleventh Answer, you grant personal vices are not a sufficient ground of separation from the Church, and say that* Protestants *did only separat themselves from the worship miserablie polluted, and because the* Roman Church *had Apostatized from the* Apostolick Doctrine. *But Sir, let me ask you, when the* Catholick Roman Church *(which before your Reformation at least was a true Church) Apostatized? And who was a competent judge to declare her Apostacie, and give you leave to separat? Was it Scripture, as according to your first rule you must say? Then I ask if two or three under pretence of a Reformation, may adhere to what they think to be in Scripture, against the judgement of the whole Church at that time? Which assuredly all must grant who teach that the true Church may erre; and so give the same libertie to all Sectaries, which they take so boldly to themselves. But albeit you say, your separation was not from our personal vices, yet you impute in the by going heresie,* denying of the souls immortalitie, whoredom to two or three of our Popes, Silvester the second, Alexander the sixth, John the twenty two. *How justly we shal presently see. But however this were true, it could no more wrong the Popes authority in his Canonical decrees*

decrees, then Davids *adultery, or* Solomons *Idolatrie in penning Scripture. Neither is it a great wonder that amongst* 240. *Popes, there have been two or three evil. Since even amongst twelve Apostles there was one Judas. Nor do Catholicks canonize all their Popes although for these three whom ye name wicked, they have* 33. *most famous Martyrs and Saints. What ever they teach as privat doctors, as it maketh no law in the Church, so it cannot derogat in the least to their decision, and doctrine as Popes. But to answer for these three, what* Martinus Polemius, *and the* Magdeburgh *say against* Silvester the second as a Magician, *is known by all the learned to be meer fables, imputed to him for his eminent knowledge and learning in the Mathematicks, which made the ninth Age wherein he lived to call him a Magician, because of its gross ignorance.* Alexander the sixth, *is also blamed for lewdness, by no impartial writter. And what* Calvin *saith* lib. 4. instit. against John 22. *is known to be errour and lies speaking of him as Pope, whatever was his opinion as a privat Doctor, of the soul before the day of judgement, which he disclaimed to be his at his death, professing and protesting that he had never any belief but that of the Catholick Church,* saith John Williams lib. 11. hist. cap. 19. *But Heretick speak of Popes as*

Rebels

Rebels of Kings, discontented subjects of Ministers of state, and criminals of their lawful judges, which no wise man will much regard. Then to shew that we have not an uninterrupted succession, you speak first of Anti-Popes, as if they did interrupt the succession of Popes more then usurpers the succession of Kings. Secondly, Of Popes deposed by Councils, but you cannot instance that any lawful Pope was deposed by any general Council what ever. Thirdly, You say the See of Rome hath vaiked for many years. To which I answer, as Kings die not, so neither Popes, as it doth not interrupt the succession of Elective Kings, that after the death of one there be long debate before the Election of another, the royal power then residing in the Electours, so neither interrupteth it the succession of Popes and their Election. You speak nothing of your own succession, because ye have none. You bragge much of a powerful Ministrie, but shews no call you had to the Ministrie from GOD, nor his Church, so we had good reason to challenge it, albeit you call this an Anti-Christian question, to ask at new upstarts who pretend to reforme the Church, who gave you a call? because the Jews had such a question to Christ. But Christ John 15. 24. saith, if he had not shewed himself to be the Son of GOD by his words and works which none else could do, we

man had been obliedged to belive him. Yet ye will have us to believe you, are lawful Ministers, without succession or a call, and that Luther and Calvin were extraordinarily sealed for Reformation, without the least sign, mark, or miracle, shewing that they were sent for that end? So that in Ministers you conclude it is the Doctrine more then the Genealogie of persons, which is so much regarded. As if preaching of true doctrine were sufficient to make a man a Minister without any ordination or call; the Scripture expresseth another thing, saying, how shal they preach except they be sent. And as to seek true succession of Bishops and Pastours in the Church from the Apostles and their successours, were to seek their Genealogy and Birth. Such answers are made to deceive the ignorants, and tell any rational man know, ye have no lawful succession at all, however, ye intrude your selves into the Ministrie upon pretence of doctrine, as all phanaticks and sectaries do.

Protestants Duply.]

Duply, Here is *multum scribere*, and a rabble of ragged discourse to smal purpose, passing from Succession, which was the question, to a call which was formerly answered. In the first part how poorly plaister you over the crimes of your three Popes, by giving *Calvin*, and the *Magdeburgenses*, and the ages wherein they lived the lie. And is this all

all your vindication of them? That it may appear this covering to be too narrow, for so foule faults, not only have *Calvin* and the *Magdeburgenses* said so: but *Platina*, *Baronius*, *Sigonius* &c. Are these also lyars? These are not authors like *Bolsecus* the Apostate, but such as ye will not deny to be credible witnesses. *Silvester the* 2. lived in the eleventh Centurie, and not in the ninth as ye mistake. Once he was called *Gerbert*, and studied the Mathematicks saith *Onuphrius*, then turned a consulter with the Devil saith *Platina*, for instance this is brought, that he enquired curiously how long he would enjoy the Papacy? And the response he received, was till he said Masse in *Jerusalem*. Within four years thereafter, he was saying Masse in the corner of the *Rond-Church* which is called *Jerusalem*, and asking how the Chappel was called, it was answered by some *Jerusalem*: Then he knew that his death was near, and becoming to be sad, he confessed his sins before many witnesses, whom he exhorted to bewarre of ambition and commerce with the Devil. Some say that he desired his body to be cutted, and layd on a cart, &c. This his tragedie is recorded also by *Polid. Virg. de invent. rerum. lib. 5. Nauclerus vol. 2. gener. 34.* If these be your Mathematicks I will learne none of them. So it is sure

by

by testimony of your own, that *Silvester* was a Magician.

Next ye say that *John* 23. your Pope is wronged by *Calvin*, for saying that he denyed the immortality of the soul, and ye alleadge what ever was his opinion as a privat Doctor, of the soul before the day of judgement, yet that he recanted his errour, and died in the faith of the Church. If *Calvin* wronge him, *Bell. lib. 4. de Pontif.* wrongeth him also, for he saith the *Cardinals* resisted him in this gross tenet; and doth dispute whither it was heresie, seeing it was not defyned in a Councel. *Nauclerus* saith that many Divines hold this Pope to be an heretick. And his successor *Benedict* did publickly condemne him and it. *Erasmus in his preface to the 5. book of Irenaus*, saith, that he laboured to propagat this heresie in *France*, and being challenged, was compelled to recant, which he did coldly (saith *Nauclerus*) had not *Calvin* then reason to say, that this Pope was heretical? Otherwise why was he put to recantation?

Thirdly, Ye say that *Alexander the 6.* was blamed by no impartial writter. Was not *Guiccardine* † impartial? What think ye of *Phil. de Comin.* † was he partial also? They give us this relation that he came by bribes to the chair. And when *Charles the 8.* intended

† *Guicc. lib. 1.*

† *Phil. de Bello Neap.*

warre against the *Turke*, the Pope advertised *Bajazet*, and promised for a summe of money to make a stop to the expedition, which the Turke undertook to pay. Was not this a holy Father? Further, *Onuphrius* telleth that he was much given to whoredom, and did beget four sons and two daughters, whom he avouched. His familie was stained with Incest. So that a Poet in these times did write this Epitaphe on his daughter;

Hoc jacet in tumulo, Lucretia nomine, sed re
Thais, Alexandri filia, nupta, nurus.

His death was tragical, for having prepared a bottel of poysoned wine, for some whom he invited to dinner, was poysoned therewith by the ignorance of his Cup-bearer, and fell into the ditch which he prepared for others; his candle was thus put out, and he left an unsavoury snuffe behinde him, as his Epitaphe witnesseth, written by *Ia. Sannazarius*, who when he hath mentioned his many faults (into which pudle I love not to raike) shutteth up all with this,

I nunc Neronis, vel Caligulas nomina,
Turpes vel Heliogabulos.
Hoc sat viator, reliqua non finit pudor,
Tu suspicare, & ambula.

Then you reflect upon the society of the Apostles, where there was one *Judas*. But when he

he fell did he not ceate to be an Apoſtle, and fall from his Miniſtrie? But your Popes continued ſuch till their death infallible; and they erred as men, but not as Popes. This could not be ſaid of *Iudas* though once an Apoſtle. They are liker to *Iudas* then any of the reſt of the Apoſtles. But to make ſuch a head of *Chriſts Church* upon Earth is a ſtrange paradox. O but ye ſay, *David* and *Solomon* fell, yet were penmen of holy Scripture. *Anſ.* They penned no Scripture while in that ſtate. I hold the *Negative* you are bound to prove the *Affirmative*, but will never do it. Their repentance was more then ordinar, witneſs *Pſal.* 51. and the book of *Eccleſiaſtes*. O if your Popes had a grain weight of their repentance, ſoon would we hear other language from them and you. Then you ſay, *that Heretickes ſpeak evil of your Popes, as criminal perſons do of a judge.* Was *Platina* a criminal perſon or heretick, and yet he marketh eminent vices in more then 33. Popes. Read him and reſent your expreſſions, or refute him as ye do *Calvin* with a broad lie and no more. You put us to it to tell the time when Rome became Idolatrous and vitious in the worſhip, &c. Which was the ground of our ſeparation. This belongeth to the former queſtion. Yet to this I ſay with reverend and learned *Biſhop Uſher*, Rome was not built in

a day, nor the great dung-hill of errour which now we see raised in it in an age, therefore it is a vain demand.

Protestants Duply. 2. Secondly; There be a difference betwixt open Heresies which oppose the foundation, and Apostacie which the Spirit hath evidently foretold, should be brought in by them who speak lies in hypocrisie. 1. *Tim.* 4. 1. 2. The impiety of the one is notorious, the other mysterious as the Apostle termeth it, 2. *Thes.* 2. 7. they who watched against the one, might sleep while the seeds of the other were in sowing, or peradventure might have a finger in bringing in this Trojan-horse under the name of devotion.

Dup. 3. Thirdly, Albeit we cannot tell day & place, when and where errours did at first beginne, yet that will not make errour truth. The *Sadducees* taught there was no Resurrection, nor Angels, can any man tell under what High-Priest this errour was broached? Shall it be a truth for that? So ye have damnable errours, but when the first seed was sowne of these tares, probably men sleeped, and an adversary hath done it. Your Anti-Popes made an interruption of succession and possession, otherwise their work was *non ens*. If so, then where is your uninterrupted succession? And if it be not such, you speak nothing to the point. You say, I cannot instance that any

lawful

lawful Pope was deposed by a Council. I hold no Pope lawful, and your School-men say, the Council cannot depose a Pope, so it is an unlawful sentence; But seeing it appeareth you are of the contrar mind, I produced the instance of *Eugenius the fourth*, deposed by the Council of *Basil*, and all the Popes were his successours, albeit the council judged *Felix* the 5. to be Pope. But after your manner, you pass with silence, what you have not mind for. You say vacancy for many years maketh no interruption, because the Pope is like an elective King, and the power in the interim concludeth in the Electours. This is loose language, for once ye make the Popes like the Kings of the Nations against *Matth.* 20. 25. then ye make no *Inter-Regnum*, but seat the power in the Electours. If so, the power is not of GOD but of man, contrar to Scripture, *John* 19. 11. *Rom.* 13. all that Electours have is the application. And if it be theirs originally, then they may depose a Pope by the Conclave. For *ejusdem est authoritate & exauthorare*. That saying *the King dieth not*, is meaned of hereditary Kings. The Pope is not such, and you will not say it. For Elective Kings, the Kingdom by his death wanteth a King, as a Burgh doth a Provost. If then the seat of the Pope vaked so long the Church was headless for many

years.

years. How make you out then the line of uninterrupted succession? You come over again upon the call of our Reformers, to which I answered formerly, that our Ministers are called of GOD, is proved by the success which some of them had in converting, confirming, convincing souls, see *Ier.* 23. 32. they who runne unsent profit not at all, but they have edified many and turned them from darkness to light. We say not that the call of *Luther* and *Calvin* was immediat, and wholly extraordinar. But admit it were so, it needed not miracles; for the *Baptist* wrought no miracles, yet was called extraordinarily. What our Lord Jesus and the Apostles did that way, are ours for use, and aggravateth the sin of those who will not believe Gospel truths. The place cited by you *Is.* 35. implyeth no more, yet it is well known that *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Knox*, *Wishart*, *Welsh*, *Davidson*, were more then ordinar men, and had the spirit of prophecie in some measure. But we will not lay weight on these things, seeing we have a more sure word of prophecie, to which we are bound to take heed. And this doth warrand us to purge out the old leaven with both our hands, that we may become a new lump. And no more is designed by our Reformation.

To conclude this then, Our first Refor-

mers

mets had as lawful ordination, as the Roman Kirk could give them. And this is a strong argument *ad hominem*. Secondly, The power which that ordination gave them, you say was to edification, we are perswaded they made use of that in a Scripture way, and edified more in one year then ye did in many. If any man called to the work of the Gospel oppose the errours of many, can that strengthen Sectaries? Did not *Paphnutius* oppose a whole Council, and was commended for it, because he walked according to the rule, and had Scripture on his side? Did not *Athanasius* oppose the whole world, almost turned *Arrian*, and who ever blamed him for so doing? The case is the same, these called men adhered to the divine commission and opposed the errours of Popery. Their praise therefore must be in all the Churches of Christ.

Question twelfth. *Ye are so broken amongst your selves, that ye look not like the primitive Christians, who had one heart and way?* Papists Quest.

Answere first, Our breaches are our burden before the Lord, and a stroak upon us, for the abuse of that great Gospell-light, under which we have long lived, but not for coming out of Babylon. Protestants Ans. 1.

Secondly, Ye Papists are more divided, for we all agree in doctrine and essentials, but Ans. 2.

ye

ye skirmish about that so frequently, that if the judgment of the Roman Church be the sentence of your Church, it is hard to know what people shall doe, tyed to beleeve as your Church doth. For sometime the Councill is put above the Pope, sometime the Pope above the Councill. The pragmatick sanction of *France* is allowed and subscribed by many, cryed down by others. Some will have a divine predetermination on the will, others only morall swasion. Some are for mediat concourse of the first cause with the second, others for immediat. If Unity be a conveniable note of the Church, ye are none.

Ans. 3. *Thirdly*, Perfect Unity in all things, is not to be expected here, so long as we know but in part. 1. *Cor.* 13. 9. If wherein we have attained we walk by the same rule, the Lord will reveal more to us in due time. *Phil.* 3. 16. If any should have said that the Church of *Corinth* was not true because of some dyvisions, or that therefore these of *Corinth* should return with the foolish *Galatians* to the covenant of workes, it had been a Solecisme in reason, yet no greater then this, to alleadge that some differences make us no Church.

Papists Reply. Reply, *In your 12. Answer, you grant your breaches amongst your selves, as your parishes for the abuse of pure Gospel light. How can ye all agree in Doctrine, except in so far as*

the

the abuse of the Gospel, which is (to say true) all the unity ye have. Neither is it wonder ye do not agree, seeing ye do not acknowledge the high Bishop successour to St. Peter, who as Hierom saith, was chosen for this among st the twelve, that a head being constituted, the occasion of Schism might be taken away. Secondly, You pretend that Catholick Romans are more divided then ye, because sometime the Council is put above the Pope, sometime the Pope above the Council. But find you this as an article of the Catholick Church? What ever hath been the opinion of sacred men, yea of Fathers and Councils thereanent, yet they were never confirmed nor owned by the Church for an Oecumenick decree. And suppose both sentences were devided, it is easily answered, that the Pope is approved to be above a Council not approved by himself, and a Council approved by a Pope is above a Pope alone, wherein there is no disagreement or contradiction. As for the pragmatick Sanction, as it hath no reference to matters of faith, so it maketh nothing for your purpose, no more then predetermination; seeing all Catholicks who hold it, think it taketh not away free-will. But then you say, perfect unity in all things is not to be expected here. So ye shew your selves conscious enough of your own divisions: and if you understand it in matters of faith, it is a blasphemy against

Gods word, which saith that there be but one GOD, one Faith, one Baptism. *If one faith, then no division of faith, without which no unity can consist. So judge you if it be not only a solecism in reason as you speak; but also in belief to joyn with the* Grecians *in Confession of Faith, albeit they deny the procession of the Holy Ghost which ye believe, or with the* Lutherians, *who hold the real presence of Christs body in the Sacrament, which ye flatly deny.*

Protestants Duply.

Duply, You grant that the Pope according to *Hierom* was first chosen, that the occasion of Schism might be taken away. Then it is clear that the Pope is not *Dominica dispositionis*, and that *Hierom* nor the Fathers did ever dream of his Monarchical Empire, as *Casaubon ad Barronii Annales*, proveth well *Exercit.* 15. A Prolocutor is the most they give to the Apostle *Peter*, they call him προεστως *aut* προστατης προηγορος, this will not make a Pope, so by adhereing to *Hierom*, you destroy the Pope. And not only was he of this opinion, but your own *Medina* telleth us, *de sacrorum hominum origini*: that *Ambrose, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Sedulius, Primasius*, mantained the same. And it is clear that *Augustin in quæst. Veteris & Novi Testamenti, quæst.* 101. homologateh all this. I'le help you further herein, to shew that I am no adversary to

truth

truth. *Gregory* the Pope prophecied, that whoso counted himself universal Bishop was Anti-Christ. And writting to *John Patriarch of Constantinople*, *epist.* 38. *lib.* 4 who did usurpe that tittle, he calleth him *Rex superbiæ*. Which title *Boniface* did take on afterwards, by *Phocas* means who killed his Master *Mauritius*, and fulfilled the prophecie of *Gregorie*. Neither *John Patriarch of Constantinople*, nor *Boniface* excluded other Bishops, as *Esthius* laboureth by this reply to make evasion. For both in the Eastern and Western Churches at that time there were Bishops whom they acknowledged such. But he is universal Bishop according to *Gregorie*, who layeth claim to the universal supremacy and extolleth himself above all, as the Pope now doth in the Church at Rome. I shal shut up this answer, with that famous consideration of *Bernard to Pope Eugenius the* 4. which words *Antonius de Dominis Arch-Bishop of Spalato*, citteth for refutation of the Popes supremacie, *Politia Ecclesiast. lib.* 5. *cap.* 2. the words are these, *Hoc quod habuit Petrus hoc dedit, solicitudinem quippe super Ecclesias, Dominationem nunquam, audi ipsum, non Dominantes inquit in clerum*, 1. *Peter* 5. 3. *Et ne dictum sola humilitate, non etiam veritate videatur, vox Domini est in Evangelio, Reges Gentium Dominantur vos*

pon he. Iergo tu inquit & aude tibi usurpare Apostolicus Dominatum aut Dominicus Apostolatum, plane ab alterutro prohiberis. This was written in the 12. Centurie, and is a full testimonie, proving that *Bernard* thought not Papal jurisdiction of divine appointment. Now sir, did you not palpablie contradict your self here, when formerly you equalized your Pope to Prophets, Apostles, and made your universal High-Bishop *juris Divini*, by saying that the evil of Schism occasioned his election at first; if so, it is *juris humani* at best, and thus you agree with *Hieron.*

Secondly, You would father a contradiction on me, because I regrate our rents proceeding from the evil use of Gospell-light, as if we held not one confession of faith. A child may conceive, that the abuse of Gospel-light, supposeth the light, but it is evil used practically, and this maketh our breaches in other things. It is beyond controversie, that the nationall stroaks under which we groan, have chiefly proceeded from the evil use of the Gospell. Light hath come amongst us, but we have walked in darkness. Will it therefore follow that we are not one dogmatically in the orthodox confession of faith. Where is this consequence founded? Neither doth the Popedome cure rents, but rai-

ther

ther make them. Experience proveth this cure to be the fomenter of the disease. For since his usurpation, moe controversies have been started in the Christian Church then formerly were heard. And if this were the cure, it is admirable, that whē the case was in *Corinth* there is no mention of that [illegible].

Thirdly, You deny that it hath been the sentence, or decree œcumenical that the Councill was above the Pope. Was it not expressly defined by the Councill of *Basil*, and doth not the 15 Act of the Councill of *Chalcedon* say that the *Roman Church* hath no priviledge above others from Christ. But the reason why at any time they had it, was because it was the seat of the Roman Empire, and that the Bishop of *Constantinople* hath equall priviledges with the Pope. Doe not all your *Sorbonists* preferre the Councill to the Pope? and all your Jesuits the Pope to the Councill? Where is your Unitie then? for as *Bellarmin* saith, *In hoc consistit summa rei*, viz. In the Popes infallible universall supremacie, without which there is no salvation to be had. Also ye make it a fundamental article of your Creed, which is more then the opinion of privat Doctours. And the very truth is, it is the foundtion and key-stone of Popery. *Quo sublato omnia corruunt*, as he saith there in his *Preface to the Treatise, de*

summo

summe Pontifice. De qua re agitur cum de primatu Pontificis agitur? Breviter respondeo, de summa rei, id enim quæritur, debeatne Ecclesia duitius consistere, an vero dissolvi & concidere. Then ye betake your self to this hold, that the Pope is above a Council not approved by himself, and the Council approved by him above the Pope. But as I said before, this giveth no more to a Council then to a Session, for if the Pope approve that, it is above his own single approbation, in regard of the additamét to it. The only question is when they differ, whose sentence is to be preferred? And about this ye differ much amongst your selves, consequently in fundamentals, for this is *caput rei*.

Fourthly, You quarrel with us for saying that perfect unity in all things is not to be expected here. And yet it is express Scripture, 1. *Cor.* 13. 9. *Phil.* 3. 15. founded upon experience. How then call you it blasphemie? *Unitas in fundamentalibus, libertas in supra fundamētalibus & charitas in omnibus*, is a saying much commended by many; and did we blaspheme by uttering this golden sentence? We are in charity with the *Lutheran* and *Greek Church* because they hold the same rule with us, viz, the Scripture. The Reformed Churches have a body of Confessions, in which they have *Concord*, and

We

we in this Church have one *Catechism*, and one *Confession of Faith*, in which we all agree. But to think that because of some other differences, we are not for one GOD, one Faith, one Baptism, it is absurd to speak so.

Question thirteenth, *May there not as yet be an accommodation and union betwixt you and us?* Papists qu. 13.

Answer, Will ye be like the Church at *Rome*, to which the Apostle *Paul* did write his Epistle, we will presently accord with any professing that faith, and not destroying it, by contradicting consequences and practices. But ye are no more like that Church of Rome, except in name, then a strumpet is like to a Virgin. The Epistle to the *Romans* is now against the *Romans*, witness, *the point of Justification*, and *subjection to the higher powers*. Protestants Ans. 1.

Secondly, Will ye take the Scripture for the only rule of faith, worship and manners? We differ from none such. But ye regard not the Scripture so much as your own traditions. For ye fainzie that it is imperfect, obscure, & must have an authoritie from your word, otherwise that is not to be believed. 2.

Thirdly, Those who have intended that work, have lost their labour and thanks at all hands; as *Cassander*, *Antonius de Dominis*, *Burnetius*, *Forbesius*. What agreemēt can the 3.

Temple

Temple of God have with Idols? 2. Cor. 6. 14.

Papists Reply.

Reply, *In your* 13. *Section, you answer to a question which no Catholick would have made if ye understand by an accommodation betwixt you and us, such as are in Scottish Tryste, we granting something to you, and ye something to us. For as to gain the whole world, a man should not lose his own soul, so, neither can he quyt one article of his faith, without which it is impossible to please God. But your way being better, asking only two conditions to make this so much desired agreement. The first is, if ye will be like that Church of* Rome, *to which the Apostle* Paul *did write his Epistle: And the second is, that we will take scripture for a rule. We most willingly grant you both, not taking scripture as every bungler who wrests it, but according to the exposition of the Church and the unanimous consent of the fathers. Appoint the meeting where ye please on these terms. He challenge no more calumnies on this Question, seeing now we are in terms of agreement, having sufficiently confuted them before.*

Protestants Duply. 1.

Duply, You say no Catholick would have moved the question. Are ye not for unidein the Lord amongst all Christians? where is your charitie now? I remember you said once nothing here was mentioned by me, but what was mentioned by others, but now your graunt this hath not come to your ears formerly

merly, this is strange. Have you not seen *Grotius* and *de Sancta Clara*? who move the same wheel. At first you seem to be against all accommodation, as much as against all reformation. You cannot quite on article, not *unum jota* saith *Bellarmin*, otherwise your Church might be declared fallible: therefore such as hanker after reconciliation with you, unless they mind to come up your length, will prove fools in the end, and lose all their labour. Yet on a sudden you forget your self, accepting of these terms offered, but in repetition you embezle them unfaithfully.

For first, will ye be like that Church, to which the Apostle *Paul* did writ *in point of justification by faith, and subjection to the Magistrat*? These two you leave out, being conscious that ye are contrar to divine direction in both these. And how cometh it to pass, that when the Apostle chap. 16. saluteth so many Saints at Rome, he omitteth the Pope? If he was then head of the Church, and maketh no mention of his supremacie, nor of their subjectiō to him, which is *summa rei*, one of your fundamentals, seeing chap. 13. he ordained them for conscience sake to be subject to *Nero*. The world may see that the Apostle *Paul* hath been no Papist.

Secondly, When you propound the second condition, it is propounded lame, barely,

you say, that ye hold the Scripture for a rule, but I said for the only rule of faith, worship, and manners. Hold that, then ye renounce traditions in matters of faith, for the law of the Lord is perfect, *Ps.* 19. The Popes infallibility, and universal supremacie; your latine worship, communion under one kind, prayers to Saints, and for the dead, Purgatory, all which are clearly confuted by Scripture. So if ye do not adhere to these conditions, the meeting will be to small purpose where ever it be appointed. *Justin Martyr Expos. recta fidei*, saith, Amongst the children of the Church, matters divine must not be ordered and directed according to mens reason and thoughts, but our speech and interpretation of them, should be fitted to the sense and will of the Spirit of GOD. *Basil in Exercit. de Fide.* It is a manifest defection from the faith, and a clear evidence of pride, either to reject any of those things which the Scripture contain, or to bring in (as a point of faith) any thing which is not written in the word; and he citeth that of our blessed Lord, *John* 10. 5. My sheep know my voice, a stranger they will not hear but flee from him. *Hilar. lib.* 1. *de Trinit.* when we speak of divine matters let us give to GOD the knowledge of himself, and let us with all veneration follow his sayings, for he is a meet witness to himself, who is not known but by himself

himself.) *Aug. lib. 6. Conf. cap. 5. (Thou hast perswaded me O GOD, that not these men who believe these books which thou in all Ages hast founded upon thy authority, are to be blamed, but such as believe them not, neither are they to be heard.) If any perchance should say to me, whence knowest thou these books, to have been minstred to man-kind by the Spirit of the one and most true GOD, even that very same thing was mostly to be believed. Aug. lib. 2. de Baptismo. contra Donatistas, (Let us not bring false ballances wherein we may weigh what we will, and as we will, according to our own arbitriment, saying, this is heavy, that is light, but let us bring the divine ballance out of the holy Scriptures, as the Lords treasurie, and let us weigh in it what is more heavy and weighty. Yea, let us not weigh only, but also acknowledge scripturall truths to be weighed and determined alreadie by the Lord. Si Scriptura habeat controversiam ex eadem Scriptura, adhibitis ejus testibus terminetur.* Aug. de doctr. Chr. lib. 3. cap. 28.

Papists Quest. 14.

Question fourteenth, *We are still gaining Proselyts from you, but few turne off from us, and become members of your Church?*

Protestants Answ. 1.

Answere, Your pelf and policie is greater then ours, hereby simple soules are ensnared.

Secondly, Ye give indulgencies for looseness,

best, this catcheth prophaine ones who love to live at random, but without some such colourable design or prejudice, we hear not that any turn off from us.

3. Thirdly, Have not sundrie left Rome in the integrity of their heart, and closed with naked persecuted truth in our Church, as the *Marquis* of *Galeacia*, *Mr. Sweton*, &c. yea, sundry have gone to *Rome* & been converted, by taking a distaste at their worship and way.

4. Fourthly, Our runawayes, runagads, have to mourn before the Lord for their Apostacie, seeing they cannot deny, that the Ordinances in our Church have been by the Lords blessing instrumental to beget children to God. This they must graunt, unless they will say, that all the reformed Church is unconverted, which they have no confidence to averre. Now how gross is it to spit in the face of her who did bear and foster them, which I wish the Lord may lay to the consciences of such revolters. But not to insist further, I desire you in the fear of God to pause and consider well, whether you are going to heaven or hell? and by what rule you walk? If the will of man, or the revealed will of God, have the power of your consciences? or whether it be safer, to take the scriptures way, in which the Prophets and Apostles walked to heaven, or the way of your own traditions

traditions and vaine inventions? He who walketh according to the scripture rule, peace and mercy shall be upon him, and upon the Israell of God.

Reply, *In your last answer you say, our pelf and policie is greater then yours, both which I grant, but glories in neither. Yet if Ministers augmentations hold on, they will shortly equal our pelf, but not our Christian policie, in employing it so well; our glorious and goodly edifices of Churches, Hospitals, Monasteries, dispersing and distributing their rents to pious uses. But the thrusting down of Churches, Hospitals, Monasteries, dispersing and dissipating their rents, testifie your want of policy, blind avarice & mad passion. Secondly, You say, we give indulgencies for looseness, as if in Catholick times, there had been greater looseness then since the Reformation. Whereas the keeping of Lent, and Fasting dayes were abolished, Penmance and satisfaction for sin taken away, Celibacie in Church men thought a crime, Laicks allowed after divorcement to marry, all good works thought impossible, the Commandments thought impossible to be keeped, and that men sin of necessity in their best actions, which, as it excuseth all wickedness and sin; so it giveth way to all looseness and prophainess. Thirdly, You say, many quit Rome in the integrity of their heart, such as the* Marquess

Papists Reply.

Marquess of Galeacia, and closed on their peril with naked truth in your Church. To which I answer, that all Heretickes and Schismatickes have quit Rome not in the integritie of their heart, but in the blindnesse of their mind, and that with their own peril, eternall damnation, closing with a very naked faith and Religion, not well clothed with the least colour of truth, but not with naked faith or belief, which Catholickes confidently and constantly assert, whatever you say to the contrar. And it is no where else to be found, for they know there is but one faith, and one GOD, and one true Church, Consequentlie united in the same faith, in all which points as she was established by Christ and his Apostles, so hath continued since their time visible in her Pastours and People in all Ages, holy and incorrupted in her Doctrine, religious in her Sacraments and ceremonies, powerfull and glorious in her wonders and miracles, conversion of Infidels, in the which the holy Fathers have lived, and all true Martyrs have died. Which only all new upstarts and Sects do persecute and oppose, as Protestants at this day, under the pretence of Reformation, and upon the same ground of wresting Scripture, against the common consent of the Church and Fathers with them. For as all divisions in Christianity have been from the Roman Catholick Church, so all have turned both their

armes

armes and pennes chiefly against her, but in vain, she is builded on a rock, against which the gates of hell shal not prevail against her. And so, who return from you to her, are neither run-awayes nor run-agads, as you call them, but like the forlorn child, or lost sheep returned. Whose example undoubtedly many more would follow, if they would consider, Faith without unity amongst Protestants, a Church without a Head, a Body without united Members, a Law without a Judge, a Temple without an Altar, Religion without Sacrifice, Divine service without Religious ceremonies, Sacraments which do not sanctifie, Doctrine without infallibility, Belief without a ground, Preachers without a call, Commandments impossible to be keeped Exhortation to what is not in our power, Reprobation without workes, Reward without Merits, Sin punished where there is no Free-will, Scripture received or rejected upon the catalogue of the Jewes, GODS word patched up by men, Reformation without authority, New-lights against old received verities, the Privat-spirit against the whole Church, single mens opinions against the unanimous consent of the Fathers, in a word, wavering Pastours, unsetled Government, unstable Faith. *In the post-script there be a parallel patched about our Reformations, which*

being

being compoſed of the gall of bitterneſs, without verity or reaſon, deſerveth no anſwer, but that which Hezekiah *commanded.* Iſ. 36. 21.

Proteſtants Duply. 1. *Duply,* You graunt that ye are rich and politick, this is true, there is much prophain policie, where *Jeſuited equivocation* is maintained. But tell me if this be like the *Godly ſincerities*, and *Goſpell ſimplicitie*, which was the old Apoſtolick way, and ground of their rejoicing. 2. *Cor.* 1. 12. If ye exceed us in ſumptuous buildings (which politickly you miſtake for the policie mentioned by me) though your ſelf be greater then ours, we want not *Hoſpitalls*, *Bridges*, *Temples*, according to our abilitie. But what is that to the doctrine which is according to Godlineſs? The *Turks* exceed you as farre that way as ye doe us. And the Temple of *Diana* at *Epheſus* exceeded you and them alſo.

Duply. 2. Secondly, You deny that Poperie foſtereth prophanneſs, but it is too apparent, and how can it be otherwiſe? If indulgencies bought and ſold like an horſe in a market, tend not *ex natura operis*, in it ſelf, to make men looſe and prophane, let any ſober man judge. For thus may they reaſon, ſhall I quite my luſts for a little money, I know what will do the buſſines, and put me in favour with God. Why ſhould I pluck out my right eye and cut off my right hand, when a little time in

in purgatorie will do the turne, and a soule-masse, which I can have for the Legacie of a summe of money will free me thence. But we with the scripture, forbid men to deceive themselves, for they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven. So with us, nothing less will satisfie then Gospell repentance, and the least ground of hope is not granted to those hereafter, who turne not away here from their iniquities. How can this be denyed, seeing your latest Casuists, such as *Escobar*, *Busenbaius* and *Diana* the *Sicilian*, have purposly devised latitudes for rendring prophane men secure about *Duells*, *Sodomy*, *and other acts of uncleanness*, which would make chaste ears to tingle. And that men who sin hainously are not bound to repent imediatly, as it is fully proved by Reverend & Learned Mr. MENZIES in his *Papismus Lucifugus pag.* 158. to 169. And when it is defended, that *minus probabile*, may be chosen although it have no ground in scripture, contrar to more probable grounds, and the stream of Doctors, doth not this open a door to make the way of Christianity broad? whereas the scripture calleth it strait and narrow. Thus ye gaine proselites. And it is observable that many loose livers in the land, who are adversaries to the power and puritie of Religion, & hate to be reformed, do encline to Popery.

And to me it is not *minus probabile*, that it is only upon this account, We are not against *fastidy, chastity, mortification.* Not do we say, *that men sin not willingly, or that good workes are impossible*, yea we hold them necessar to salvation. Only we deny that fals man can be justified by the workes of the law, otherwise we needed not a Saviour nor a Gospell-remedy. It is your ordinar way to mistate questions and then intend a skirmish which is easie work; this is a sinfull and shallow evasion.

3. Thirdly, You fall out with bauling expressions, which rational men cannot value much and scoffe at these worthies, who did take their lives in their hands, and closed with persecuted truth, neither for gaine nor for honor, but for conscience sake. Was not this a commendable duty? If self-deyall be not a chief ingredient in Christian performances I know not the Gospell. You assert that it was blindnes not integrity. I averre, it was integrity and not blindnes; *Who are thou that judgest another mans servant?* remember thou shalt be judged. You talk much concerning the authority and unity which is amongst you but some who were at Rome, and have come not long ago from you to us againe, tell what sort of integritie, puritie and chastitie is amongst you. So it is no wonder their many

tongues

tongues and pennes be employed to pull down that whorish *Babell*, which ye call *Zion*.

Fourthly, You imply that none can be saved, but such as are subject to the Pope, Therefore our run-awayes must not be apostats with you; for they are Prodigals returned, and lost sheep found. When I pray you went they from you to us? Were they not baptized in our Church, and partakers of all ordinances with us till of late? Then I pose you and them again, whither ye damn all who are not Popish, and judge them unconverted? If they be Hereticks, in your sense this must follow. Yet you have not the confidence to speak it directly. And sure I am, Scripture requireth not *subjection to the Pope*, as an article of the Creed. If without this a man cannot be saved, albeit he believe, and live like the Gospel, the Apostle *Paul* was no chosen Vessel, which is contrar to Scripture; there was no Pope in his dayes, nor long after that. Your Church hath been visible by bell, book, and candle, fire, faggot, pomp, policie. Your Pastours are more for the fleece then the flock. Ye are superstitious by addition, subtraction, multiplication, without any warrand. Your Ceremonies are partly Paganish, partly Jewish, and for the most Schismatick, so not religious nor venerable. Your miracles & wonders are such, that

4.

it is good for you to have them wrought in *America*, and told in *Europe*. Like are ye to him who comeeth with lies and wonders, 2. *Thess.* 2. 9. Your conscience can witness what Leger-demain is in these. And it is our way to try miracles by the Scripture. I wish Infidels were converted to the Christian faith, and not to a faction. By the Scripture, not by topperies and military Compulsions. *Stephen*, the Apostles, and some primitive Fathers were Martyrs, but they died not in the Romish Faith as it is now maintained. And how can your Church be called Catholick, which is a particular one, wherein be many dissenters? It is not strange to us, albeit ye indulge them who runne away, and Apostatize from us, but it is strange why they have done so, and what hath fascinated them to burst all bonds and swallow on a sudden the whole bulk of Popery. It requires an Ostrich stomach to digest such iron. Where in did Gospel-truths, Gospel-worship, or their mother and nurse weary them, resist against her if they can?

Fifthly, You say, *we have Faith without unity*, then you grant us such, and our unity in fundamentals is more than your own. *A Church without a head.* We acknowledge no Pope head of our Church, Christ is our head, and the visible Government of the Church

is

is Aristocratical, not Monarchical, the mystical Members of his Body are united to him; *so we are not a body without united members.* Neither want we a Judge in controversal matters. It is known that many points of Christianity cannot be judged by men, because the Kingdom of Grace is within us, and consisteth not in meat or drink, but righteousness, peace, and joy in the holy Ghost, *Rom.* 14. 17. Who will say that the hidden man in the heart, can be cognosced by any external living judge on earth? The spiritual man judgeth all things, but he himself is judged of no man, 1. *Cor.* 2. 15. The written word is the rule of this and other such cases. For other matters we have Councils, and Church Rulers appointed by the supream Judge, who are bound to discern according to Scripture, and all are appointed to obey them in the Lord; so, *we have not a Law without a Judge.* The golden Altar is our Altar, we have Sacrifices of Prayer and Praises, and one living sacrifice is better then many carcases; *that is reasonable service,* Rom. 12. 1. Then *we have order and decency,* and such positives as set forth the worship in a Gospel way, without pompous observation, therefore we lack not an *Altar, Sacrifices, and Ceremonies* in such manner as Gospel-work under the New Testament requireth. Our Sacraments are

instruments

instruments to seal and sanctifie, our rule is infallible, for it is Scripture; the grounds of our faith are such as will not make us ashamed, for we have his revealed will and word for it. Therefore it is a calumny to say, we *have Sacraments which do not sanctifie, Doctrine without infallibility, and Belief without a ground.* If our Preachers had runne unsent, the Lord had not sealed their Ministrie with such success, *Ier.* 23. 32. It may be spoken without vanity, to the praise of free-grace, that there be many real, sincere, serious, solid Christians in BRITTAIN. Blessed be the Lord, we go not without our Coverts who can speak with any adversary in the gate. And they will and do bless our Ministry upon the brink of eternity, which hath been the power of GOD to their Salvation. *So our Ministry is not without a call*; we say not *that any divine command is in it self impossible to be keeped*, but that fallen man through his own fault is imperfect in obedience, and without Christ can do nothing. *Iohn* 15. 5. If you say more speak it out, for it will be plain *Pelagianism*. Exhortations and communications are means to make us willing and obedient. It is not in our power to think a good thought as of our selves, dare you deny this? Why then fall you fondly on us speaking with the Scripture? *Luke* 17. 10. By grace we are saved freely, through faith

and eternal life is the gift of GOD, the reward is a free remuneration, and may be without our merits; we grant free-will in *Augustins* sense, and *Faustulus* proveth that this is true liberty, by arguments which were never yet answered. But we do disclaim *Jesuitical indifference*, because it taketh away divine providence, the power of grace; and setteth up anti-providences from the will of man. Because we sin willingly, who can deny that we are punished justly? Neither take we the Scripture Catalogue from the Jewes; but make use of reason, testimonies from old Writters, universal consent, to be a poreh for entrie to the knowledge of the humerick controversie, and how can you say so of our Catalogue, seeing we maintain no book to be Scripture, but such as ye allow. And are ye not helped by the Jewes herein as wel as we? Only we say that the authority of the Scripture, dependeth not on humane testimonie, as upon its principal foundation, nor yet upon unwritten tradition; because divine faith must be begotten by a divine testimonie. And we believe the Scriptures authority and truth *fide divina*, because the Lord hath spoken it. In this true faith must be finally resolved, else it is not divine. It is a calumny to say, *we build the Word*, seeing *we* make Scripture the only rule of our faith. There be none in the

Christian Church, who adde such patches to the word of GOD as ye. Our Reformation had authority both from Heaven and men on earth. The Lawes of the Land can testifie this, which are yet in vigor for it and against you. And there may be new light in time of darkness, which was formerly dimmed or put out, which light is the good old light, proceeding from the Father of lights. If ye condemned this, the world should have still continued *Arrian*, when it was over-clouded with it: and all Reformation even the Scripture one is unlawful, see you not your absurdity here? Yea, it was prophesied, *Dan.* 12. 4. that in the latter times knowledge should encrease, and light also be extended; but *light without verity* deserveth not the name. Privat men have the liberty of discerning allowed to them, *Acts* 17. 11. *1 Cor.* 14. 1. Yea, such may have publict spirits and be called to publict employments. But what you mean by this I conceive not. For the Gospel worship which we maintain hath the consent of all the Scriptures, Churches, and primitive Fathers, as is formerly proved to the full: We wish the hearts of all our Pastors may be established by grace, that they may be subjected to him who hath the government on his shoulder, and by their faith working by love, glorifie the chief Shepheard

of

of the flock. We will not recriminat railing for railing, but we were eaſie to ſhew, *To have a Church compoſed ſtate-wayes. Your policie devoureth all piety; Your ſuperſtitions vowes againſt marriage all chaſtity; Your impeaching of the Scriptures, all divine verity; Your blind allegiance to the Pope, all loyalty; Your ſuperſtitious huskings, all puritie. Your worſhip in an unknown tongue, all fervencie; Your addition to the one Sacrament, and mutilation of the other, all ſincerity; Your univerſal infallible ſupremacie, all primitive antiquity.*

It is not long ſince this Reply came to my hand, at the firſt view whereof, I intended to take in and diſcuſs arguments propoſed by *Dr. Vane*, in that Pamphlet entituled *The loſt ſheep found*. And theſe contained in another of the ſame kind, called *Presbytries tryall*. And to ſurvey the other two entituled, *The Touchſtone*, and *Five lux*. But finding the ſubſtance of all theſe in this reflecter, and that he hath little of his own, but maketh malt for the moſt of their barley, by anſwering this, all the foure are materially anſwered, which a diſcerning Reader will find to be true. Now to cloſe, I obteſt all who read this Vindication of the reformed Religion, to conſider the cauſe ſeriouſly without partialitie, pride, paſſion, prejudice. Remember that, *Iames* 2. 1. *Have not the faith of our Lord Ieſus with reſpect of perſons*, And the ſpirit of truth lead you into all truth: The ſpirit of errour and lies be rebuked and reſiſted by the

Lord: That a pure offering may be offered to Him, from the rising of the Sun to the going down thereof.

FINIS.

A POSTSCRIPT,

Containing an *Advertisement* and *Advice* to the Merchants of *DVNDIE*, who travell abroad: that they be not ensnared with the fopperies of *Poperie*.

AFter the writting of this VINDICATION, I judged it expedient, to give this word of Advertisement and Advice, to such as be called by their affairs, to negotiat in Countreys where the Popish worship is only professed, and, mantained. Because many travellers return home from these places, as that *French fool* came back from *Rome*, who passing through *Ravenna*, least he should return empty to his friends, gathered in that Forrest a multitude of bees, and flies, which being closed into a cloath bagge, he poured forth amongst his relatives, to their prejudice and offence. And all they gained by his voyage was made up of stings and buzings. So when travellers return from forrain Nations, either Neutral, Nullifidians, or leavened with Popish superstition, what is their purchase? Nothing that can edifie any. Will ever practical Atheism, Gallioes temper, or tampering betwixt truth and errour, ad-

vantage a man at the long runne? Not at all. Those will sting like a serpent, more then themselves. a wound and dishonour may they have by it, but nothing else.

The hazard which some Travellers runne cannot be unknown to you. For the man who in this City hath become Popish, and stingeth some, is thought by all that know him, to have received the first dye thereof abroad, when he travelled thither. And although the flecks of that pestiferous malady, broke not forth immediatly after his return; till the *Cardinus Maledictus* of prejudice against some fellow Citizens made them appear, yet there probably he was first infected. Now if he who was gifted above many Merchants, catched so sore a back-ward fall abroad, that he hath now turned his back on that Church, wherein he was born and fostered. Have ye not reason with full purpose of heart to cleave to the truth of GOD, which can only set you free. It is not for nought that our Saviour said to his Disciples, *Luke* 17. 32. *Remember Lots wife.*

It is certain that the Church of SCOTLAND is a great eye-sore to Papists, and they craftily lay snares to seduce her members at home and abroad. Their hooks are feathered with variety of colours, and the Convent at *Rome, de Propaganda fide*, furnisheth many Emissaries, who spare no pains to make Proselyts. If any PROTESTANT fall sick abroad where the Inquisition is, then

they

they threaten to deprive him of burial, and putting on the Boars skine, would Hector and cudgel him by menacing wayes, from the pure reformed Religion. At home they are cloathed in Sheeps cloathing, and with fair words deceive the simple, or such who are willing to be deceived. Will it not then be expedient to take a long and weigh these six Counsels for your conduct, that ye make not Ship-wrak of Faith and a good Conscience.

Counsel first, Look on all places where ye cannot enjoy publick ordinances safely, as cages full of snares. Therefore act fervent acts of faith on Iesus Christ, for through-bearing; and pray in faith, that ye be not deserted nor lead into temptation. Faith is the victory whereby ye must overcome. 1. *John* 5. 4. By it ye may obtain the victory, and be more then conquerours. *i. e.* Ye shal overcome before ye fight, whereas other Conquerours fight first, then overcome. *It* is told in the life of *Augustin*, that when he was musing how to resist some temptations, he heard a voice saying, *Ite stas & non stas*, whereupon he conceived that this was the meaning of it, thou cannot escape by ought which thou canst do, but must stand it out by borrowed strength from *Iesus Christ*. Nothing will satisfie faith, nor uphold a man under tryals, but divine presence, when the Lord said to *Israel*, *Ex.* 33, that he would send an Angel to attend them amongst their adversaries,

versaries, they mourned, verse 4. because he said that he would not go himself with them. Nothing ye resolve will preserve and keep your garments clean in this case, but the strengthning presence of *Jesus Christ*, through which ye can do all things, *Phil.* 4. 13. and without which ye are able to do nothing. *It* concerneth you therefore under no less hazard then your standing or falling, not to grieve this holy Spirit, with spiritual or carnal wickedness, lest ye deprive your self of his presence, and become naked to your shame, in a strange land before superstitious men. Walk circumspectly, and bewarre of spiritual pride, which is ordinarily punished, and sometimes cured by a spiritual fall. Fear is faiths watch, and albeit the wicked fear where no fear is, yet fore-sight of Soul-danger joyned with the fear of our own wickedness, is a part of that wisdom recommended, *Matth.* 10, 16. And blessed is he who feareth thus alwayes, *Pro.* 28. 14. *It* is well observed by *Augustin*, that albeit the Jewes had many penal statutes, yet none for exile, the reason which he giveth, is, *Ne exul hoc passu Idololatriæ periculo exponeretur*. For fear lest abroad they should be exposed to the hazard of Idolatrie. Then when ye are absent from pure Ordinances, commercing with adversaries, in all that work, should ye not walk like men on ice, for fear of a fall? The worst is to be suspected in these places, *Gen.* 20. 11.

Counsel

Counsel second, Take heed to your Conversation during your abode in *Meseth*. A loose prophane life staineth Profession, and will bring up an evil report on Religion, it strengthneth adversaries and causeth them blaspheme that holy Name by which ye are called, *Ezek.* 36. 20. The people are sore challenged for this, that in a strange land they prophaned the holy Name of the Lord, when they said to them, *these are the people of the Lord, and are gone forth out of his land.* But if ye be holy in all manner of conversation, and righteous in your dealings, thereby the Reformed Religion is lustred, and adversaries if they be not converted, will be convinced, that an evil tree could not bring forth so good fruit: and whereas they speak against you as evil doers, they may be ashamed who falsly accuse your good conversation in Christ. 1. *Pet.* 3. 16. Yea, a close Christian carriage is in it self a guard against many errours of Popery, and will make adversaries the more loath to trouble you. So hath Providence ordered it, that the Image of GOD, which after GOD is created in righteousness and holiness, *Eph.* 4. 24. becometh awful to many men. And as the Lord maketh the beasts of the Earth to stand in awe of man, made according to his Image, so unregenerat men are affrighted to have to do with such, *Herod* feared *Iohn*, *Marke.* 6. 20. knowing that he was a just man, and an holy. The Wife of *Pilat* sent him word, to have nothing

thing to do with that juſt man, *Matth.* 27. 19. *Reyner the Inquiſitor* giveth this teſtimonie concerning the *Valdenſes*, and *Albigenſes*, who in ſubſtantials profeſſed the ſame Religion with us; *that it was ſaid, they were of old ſtanding, lived juſtly before men, and believed all things well, concerning GOD, therefore were the more to be feared.* And *Plinius the ſecond*, giving an account to *Trajan*, how holy and harmleſs the Chriſtians were, was commanded not to follow after them any more. Therefore, as ye would not give advantage to adverſaries againſt you, and your Profeſſion, walk cloſely with GOD. And amongſt ſtrangers eſtrange him not from you. *Qui ſciens relle non facit, omittit ſcire quod rectum eſt*, ſaith, *Auguſt. de Nat. & Gratia. cap.* 67.

Counſel third, Eſchew all occaſions which are apt to lead you into temptation, and go not to thoſe places or ſocieties which may prove a ſnare to you. When *Peter* went to the High-Prieſts hall, a ſmal temptation, the accuſation of a Damſel did overcome him. And *Naaman*, 2. *King.* 5. craveth pardon for going to the houſe of *Rimmon*, albeit he was then ſerving his Maſter. For the words may be taken of the time paſt, and ſo they are tranſlated *Pſalm.* 51. in the tittle, and *Pſalm* 54. 1. *Evah* looked on the apple, and then did eat. The Apoſtle *Jude* giveth a ſure rule for your direction in ſuch caſes; *Jude* 23. *Auguſtine* in his Confeſſions, *Confeſſ. lib.* 6. *cap.* 7. 8. & 9. telleth

of

of his intimat friend, that he once intended to see the *Gladiatores*, and against his consent would go to the Theatre, & behold that mad murthering exercise, but promised to him, to guard against the temprations of the place, yet notwithstanding of this restitution he was catched into the snare, and returned with an evil conscience. When the Lord giveth forth his Commands negative, all appearances, occasions or preparatory dispositions to evil are forbidden. What ever learned men may look on at a distance, that they may the more easily refute that way of worship; yet every one is not fit to view the camp of an adversary. *In Comitiis Augustanis, anno* 1530. history telleth us, that the *Protestant Princes in Germany* would not convoy *Charles the 5. to the Masse, and processions, In festo Corporis Christi* because they perceived a designed snare in it, and an offence. A snare set in the sight of a bird will be avoided. Much more have ye reason to go by the ditch, whom the Lord hath made wiser then the beasts of the Earth or birds of the Air; that whore sitteth on many waters, if ye stand on the brink and look long to these, your head may take a round, and ye fall into the deep. Wherefore is it *that there be such pompous schenick actings, charming, musick, Laxe Casuists amongst Romanists*, if not for entrapping those who go by. An old noble man in this land, who lived and died a good *Protestant*, told me that when he was young he travelled to *Rome*, and out of curiosity desired he might be ad-

 mitted

mitted to see the *Popish ceremonies, monuments and rites*, which the Conclave at first refused, but the next day *Bellarmin* being present, who was absent in the former dyet, it was granted by his mediation. He in this was more witty then the rest, and did take the neatest way for ensnaring the *Noblemen*, albeit it pleased the Lord to preserve him. Abstaine then from all appearance of evil, and knit not a snare to your self with your own hands. The fume of that cup of fornication hath made some drunk, make as quick dispatch as ye may home-ward, some temptations are best overcome by resisting, and standing it out, *Eph.* 6. 14. 1. *Pet.* 5. 9. others are foiled better by flying, nor medling, as *Idolatry*, *Adultery*, *Fornication*, 1. *Cor.* 6. 18. 1. *Cor.* 10. 14. *Flee fornication flee from idolatry*, saith the Apostle. Therefore, carry in this as men in infected places, come away quickly, *longe, cito, tarde*, and linger not there, lest ye be taken up in the snare.

Counsel fourth, Be busie in secret when the occasion of publick worship is denyed to you. They who have not the opportunity of a publick market, saith one, should be the more diligent to have nurseries or store at home. In cases of this kind, closing of the doot, and secret work is necessar; then ye are called to spend the Lords-day *in spiritual meditation, prayer, praises*. So was that divine man of GOD employed in the *Isle Pathmos*, and received rich allowance from on high, *Rev.* 1. 10. When *David* was driven from the Temple, he had Temple work alone

alone, in the wilderness of *Mayn* the Lord was no wilderness to him. When *Jacob* was retired, he wrestled and prevailed; he found the Lord at *Bethel, and there he spake with us. Hos.* 12. 4. That is, the fruit of that work, and the examplary carriage of this tender Believer belongeth to the whole Israel of GOD: much of the work of a Christian is transacted in secret, and we under the Gospel have this priviledge, which was not under the Law, that the Christian sacrifice, *reasonable service* may be offered every where *Is.* 4. 23. 1. *Tim.* 2. 8. it's then when a Christian hath fewest diversions, may enjoy much of GOD and himself, use greatest freedom, have most accesse, and word his particular cases best. One saith, that Jesus Christ is sweet company, but frequently sweetest to the sense alone. And what is more edifying for a particular Believer, amongst *Augustines* works nor his Soliloquies? Therefore in this exigence, meditat much *on the Lords Word, his Workes, your own weakness, wants, feares, experiments, the excellency of Jesus Christ, the bitternesse of sin, of death, judgement, eternity; and how precious your soules are beyond the gold of Ophir.* Consider seriously that no merchandise can avail you, if ye purchase not the pearle of price; who knoweth the worth of that jewel? None but he to whom the arm of the Lord is revealed. In your secret retirements the Lord may acquaint your hearts with himself, and give you songs in the night. *Baldwin* in his cases propoundeth some directions, page 206. how men

shal be exercised when they are necessitated to de-
fert the publick worship. *First*, If the administer-
tion of the Word and Sacraments, be not embezell
nor corrupted contrar to the written word; then
none conscionably betake themselves to privat exer-
cise, in the time of publick worship, because it is
contrar to that *Heb.* 10. 25. *forsake not the assem-
bling of your selves as the manner of some is.* The
publick hath more of the promise, *Matth.* 18. 20.
This by the context must be understood of such pub-
lick meetings as have power of binding and loosing.
Micah fell into a sin not only of Schism, but of Ido-
latry, when in that place where the Lord had cal-
led a Ministry, he without a call set up privat wor-
ship in his house to the prejudice of the publick, *Judg.*
17. This is his first position which he layeth down
as a foundation. *Secondly*, If the worship be cor-
rupted as in Popery, then Christians should call an
orthodoxe Minister, who is called of GOD to the
work and hath the promise, *Rom.* 10. 14. and go a-
bout their worship at home, for this he citeth *Lu-
ther*, *Tom.* 6. *fol.* 275. *Thirdly*, If no Minister
can be had in the place, where the Lord calleth the
lot of a Christian for the time, then he should be di-
ligent in reading and searching the Scriptures. If
his mind is become weak here, he should take help
from conference, either with the dead who yet speak
by their books, or with the living. If he be a Master
of a family, then he may pray, read the word of GOD
which is an ordinance, *Deut.* 11. 19. and instruct
his

his family, according to his ability. Now from these positions, this may be proportionably gathered that when Merchants travelling in Popish Countreys stay there on the Sabbath; they should be well employed on that day, by doing the work of the Lord diligently with both their hands. This is the way to be free of the power of tẽpration throughout the week, & to make you prosper the better in your affairs. Our successe in temporalls hath ordinarily a connexion with our through-bearing in spirituals, as appeareth from the case of *Abrahams* servant, *Gen.* 24. 14. 15.

Counsel fifth, When ye are deprived thus of the publick worship, regrate your mispent Sabbaths, mis-heard sermons, and that ye made so frequently that feast-day of the Lord a fast-day, and starved your self without necessity; it is the Winter-season, and a providenced retirement to you, which is denounced as a calamity, *Matth.* 24. 24. Beside the sinnes and snares of your calling which are not few, the evil use of ordinances at home, may bring to your minde this much; that it is just with the Lord morally to shut you up that ye cannot come forth. Many Prophets, and righteous men desired to see the dayes of the Son of man, which ye did see and depretiated. As in temporals, fulness of bread procureth famine: so in spirituals, when men who have the occasion will not serve the Lord, *Deut.* 28. 47. Spiritual famine is threatned to such, *Amos* 8. Therefore long much for a communion in publick Ordinances with your mother Church. And when ye

remember

remember her towers, bulwarks, and how a high throne in the Sanctuary is for the Lord there, then let your soul be poured forth in you, *Psalme* 42. 4. and with these who did hang up their harps, *Psalme* 137. by the rivers of *Babylon*, lay bonds on your selves, never to forget your *Jerusalem, the valley of vision*, and if the Lord return you home in peace, spit not in her face, who is the joy of the whole earth, but glorifie the Lord in the house of his glorie upon his own day, according to the prophecie *Isai.* 60. 7. (which now to us is a precept) in the beauty of ordinances, as in former dayes, where the man amongst the myrtle trees, cloathed with a garment down to the foot, girt about with a golden girdle, whose voice is as the sound of many waters, shall be seen walking amongst the golden candle-sticks. That is *festus dies Domini*, saith, *Ambrose lib.* 2. *de Cain & Abel, cap.* 2. *ubi perfecta virtutum gratia est, ubi victor animus liber est a seculo.* Then ye dedicat a day to the Lord, when ye worship him in spirit and truth thus. Fill your heart in secret with fixed purposes to enter on this work at your homecoming, seeing ye may better know the worth of Ordinances by the want of them.

Counsel sixth, Pray much in secret for a discovery to Papists of their sinful worship, the sight whereof is sufficient to confirm discerning men, in the truth professed by us. It is lamentable that so many knowing men, should upon a secular interest for upholding the pompous Papacie, detain the truth

truth in unrighteousnes. When *Ezekiel chap. 8.* did see the image of jealousie he mourned, and received with the rest of the mourners for the abomination of the place, a mark of preservation chap. 9. so should ye do for these abominations. *Peccatum tuum est quod tibi non displicet* said *Augustin.* How shal your displacency, be better attested, unles ye were called to a publick confession? Overcome their evil with good, and pray for them who are ready to persecute you, that the Lord would turne them from darkness to light, and the power of errour to truth: & also, that he would enlarge the Gospell by the power of his own Arme; that yet Rivers may run in that Desert, and the Myrtle may grow where the Bramble is. *The zeal of the Lord of Hosts can performe this.* The times are like the latter dayes being so perrillous, See *Brightman in Apoc. Mr. Medes Synchronismus*, and *concerning the Apostacie of the latter time. Master Durrham on the Revelation*, then it is that knowledge shall encrease and *Babylon* fall, if many mistake not his minde who governeth all.

Roma diu titubans, variis erroribus acta,
Corruet, & mundi desinet esse caput.

Rome tottering long, possest with errours strong,
Shal tumble down, and prime no more ere long.

FINIS.